DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 482 483 FL 027 903

AUTHOR	Magnan, Sally Seiloff, Ed.
TITLE	Challenges in the 1990s for College Foreign Language Programs. Issues in Language Program Direction: A Series of Annual Volumes.
ISBN	ISBN-0-8384-2548-8
PUB DATE	1990-00-00
NOTE	244p.; Prepared by the American Association of University Supervisors, Coordinators, and Directors of Foreign Language Programs.
AVAILABLE FROM	Heinle & Heinle Publishers, 20 Park Plaza, Boston, MA 02116. Tel: 800-730-2214 (Toll Free); Fax: 800-730-2215 (Toll Free); Web site: http://www.heinle.com.
PUB TYPE	Books (010) -- Collected Works - General (020)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC10 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Computer Assisted Instruction; Computer Uses in Education; Curriculum; Elementary Secondary Education; French; Graduate Students; Higher Education; Holistic Approach; Language Proficiency; Language Teachers; Methods Courses; Preservice Teacher Education; *Second Language Instruction; Teaching Assistants; *Teaching Methods; Teaching Styles; Team Teaching; Textbooks
IDENTIFIERS	Minnesota

ABSTRACT

This collection of papers includes the following: "Style Wars: Teacher-Student Style Conflicts in the Language Classroom" (Rebecca L. Oxford, Madeline E. Ehrman, and Roberta Z. Lavine); "Articulating Learning in High School and College Programs: Holistic Theory in the Foreign Language Curriculum" (Janet Swaffar); "Reconsidering the FL Requirement: From Seat-Time to Proficiency in the Minnesota Experience" (Betsy K. Barnes, Carol A. Klee, and Ray M. Wakefield); "Team Teaching French with Teaching Assistants" (Theodore E.D. Bruan and Bonnie A. Robb); "On Apples and Oranges: The Effects of Integrating Beginners and False Beginners in Elementary French Classes" (Steven J. Loughrin-Sacco); "The Question of Language Program Direction is Academic" (James F. Lee and Bill VanPatten); "The Graduate Teaching Assistant in an Age of Standards" (Joseph A. Murphy); "Advancing the Case for an Advanced Methods Course" (John F. Lalande II); "Bridging the Gap Between Teaching and Learning: A Critical Look at Foreign Language Textbooks" (Renate A. Schulz); "CALL Today: Implications for Multisectioned Language Programs" (Robert Ariew); and "The Preparation and Support of Graduate Teaching Assistants in Foreign Languages: A Bibliography" (David P. Benseler and Christine Cronjaeger). (Papers contain references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 482 483

AAUSC
Issues in Language Program Direction
A Series of Annual Volumes

Challenges in the 1990s for College Foreign Language Programs

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sean Ketchem

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U S DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Sally Sieloff Magnan
Editor

1990

P 87 .C43

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HH
Heinle & Heinle Publishers

Challenges in the 1990s for College Foreign Language Programs

Sally Sieloff Magnan
Editor

HH

Published by
Heinle & Heinle Publishers
A Division of Wadsworth, Inc. Boston, MA 02116

© Copyright 1991 by Heinle & Heinle Publishers. No parts of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Manufactured in the United States of America.

Heinle & Heinle Publishers is a division of Wadsworth, Inc.

ISBN 0-8384-2548-8

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2

American Association of University Supervisors, Coordinators, and Directors of Foreign Language Programs (AAUSC)

Issues in Language Program Direction
A Series of Annual Volumes

Series Editor: *Sally Sieloff Magnan*, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Managing Editor: *Charles J. James*, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Editorial Board
David P. Benseler, Ohio State University
Jean-Pierre Berwald, University of Massachusetts
Kenneth Chastain, University of Virginia
Claire Gaudiani, Connecticut College
Alice Omaggio Hadley, University of Illinois
Theodore V. Higgs, San Diego State University
Dieter Jedan, Murray State University
Claire Kramsch, University of California, Berkeley
Dorothy Rissel, State University of New York–Buffalo
Carlos Solé, University of Texas at Austin
Wilga Rivers, Harvard University
Albert Valdman, Indiana University

Acknowledgments

On behalf of the membership of AAUSC, we, the editors and authors of this first annual volume, wish to extend our sincerest appreciation to Heinle & Heinle Publishers, and especially to Publisher Stan Galek, whose vision and leadership have made this series a reality. For their work and enthusiasm during the critical production stages we also wish to express our thanks to Patricia Jalbert, Production Supervisor, and Cheryl Carlson, College Marketing Manager. It is a pleasure to work with a company dedicated to innovation and quality in foreign language education, one product of which is the present volume.

For their invaluable insights and careful reading of manuscripts, we must also recognize here the expertise and efforts of the members of the Editorial Board, whose diligent work has helped ensure the high quality of this volume.

Finally, a special word of acknowledgment is due to Robert Magnan for his expert assistance and personal support throughout the preparation of the manuscript.

This first annual volume, which we are proud to present to the profession, owes much to the efforts of all those just named and many others unnamed.

Sally Sieloff Magnan
Charles J. James

Contents

Introduction *vii*

Style Wars: Teacher-Student Style Conflicts in the Language Classroom
Rebecca L. Oxford, Madeline E. Ehrman, Roberta Z. Lavine 1

Articulating Learning in High School and College Programs: Holistic Theory in the Foreign Language Curriculum
Janet Swaffar 27

Reconsidering the FL Requirement: From Seat-Time to Proficiency in the Minnesota Experience
Betsy K. Barnes, Carol A. Klee, Ray M. Wakefield 55

Team Teaching French with Teaching Assistants
Theodore E. D. Braun and Bonnie A. Robb 71

On Apples and Oranges: The Effects of Integrating Beginners and False Beginners in Elementary French Classes
Steven J. Loughrin-Sacco 89

The Question of Language Program Direction Is **Academic**
James F. Lee and Bill VanPatten 113

The Graduate Teaching Assistant in an Age of Standards
Joseph A. Murphy 129

Advancing the Case for an Advanced Methods Course
John F. Lalande, II 151

Bridging the Gap Between Teaching and Learning: A Critical Look at Foreign Language Textbooks
Renate A. Schulz 167

CALL Today: Implications for Multisectioned Language Programs
Robert Ariew 183

The Preparation and Support of Graduate Teaching Assistants in Foreign Languages: A Bibliography
David P. Benseler and Christine Cronjaeger 207

Contributors 233

Introduction

The American Association of University Supervisors, Coordinators, and Directors of Foreign Language Programs (AAUSC) is pleased to introduce, on its tenth anniversary, this series, *Issues in Language Program Direction*. In accordance with the mission of AAUSC, these annual volumes aim to foster scholarship and research in postsecondary foreign language learning and teaching. Through the dialogue provided in these volumes, AAUSC hopes to contribute to the development of language acquisition theory and to the improvement of undergraduate curricula and methodological preparation of teaching assistants.

As we rapidly approach the twenty-first century, our profession faces a potential crisis of having too few qualified teachers for increasing numbers of foreign language students. Indeed, we already benefit from renewed national interest in language learning, which is stimulating creation or reinstatement of college language requirements for both entrance and graduation. This renewed appreciation of language study is bringing us, in addition to students who are fulfilling degree requirements, more upper-level learners and majors who, excited by their high school language experience, wish to continue with a foreign language in college.

Who will teach these students? How will the next generation of college foreign language instructors be prepared? In the past decade of professional accountability, we have heard many calls for higher teacher standards linked with national demands for improved education. The profession responded with guidelines and recommendations in many areas of *elementary* and *secondary* instruction; but the *college* curriculum remained relatively unaffected, except in the area of preparation of secondary school teachers.

We now embrace the ideal that foreign language instruction is for *all* students, whatever their professional goals. Our changing student body is making new demands on our programs. As many colleagues have advocated, it is time to reject traditional divisions between beginning and intermediate language programs and upper-level study of litera-

ture, linguistics, and civilization. It is also time to reject the traditional boundaries between college departments that reserve teaching in languages other than English as the exclusive domain of "foreign language" departments.

We need to create a more continuous curriculum that begins an international and sociolinguistic perspective to language learning in our basic skill courses and continues and expands it through our advanced literature, linguistics, and civilization classes. We need also to work with colleagues in other disciplines to design content courses taught in languages other than English: for example, a history course taught in French, perhaps jointly by History and French faculty.

Clearly, such a broadening of scope of our undergraduate curricula, combined with the challenge of offering students a broad and articulated learning experience, places considerable demands on faculty. The expectation of hiring many new faculty in the next decade puts our profession at a crossroads: our students will be able to pursue new directions in foreign language learning only if we prepare faculty to meet these greater demands. Establishing high standards for preparing future college faculty is now as necessary as creating innovative programs in which they will work.

Most college faculty learn to teach in two ways: by following the models of their own professors and by working as language teaching assistants under the direction of a faculty supervisor, most often the director of basic language courses. The language program director thus fulfills two key functions in most departments: designing and implementing basic curriculum for undergraduates and preparing teaching assistants for their future professional careers.

Issues in Language Program Direction will address this group of faculty in particular, but not exclusively. It will also examine topics of interest to teaching assistants, faculty, and administrators, issues that extend from basic language courses to the entire undergraduate curriculum. Indeed, the main purpose of this series is to encourage cooperative research and scholarship and program innovation. Toward this end, AAUSC is pleased to present the first volume, *Challenges for the 1990s in College Foreign Language Programs*.

This volume presents papers in four key areas: 1) structure and articulation of language courses, 2) responsibilities of the language program director, 3) methodology courses and teaching assistant preparation, and 4) pedagogical materials. Seven articles are position papers; two are reports of innovative efforts at specific institutions; one is a research study; and the last is a comprehensive bibliography. Taken together, they represent the diverse interests of AAUSC, its members,

and, we hope, the readers of this series.

The volume opens with an examination of the most basic element of instruction, the relationship between teacher and student. In "Style Wars: Teacher-Student Style Conflicts in the Language Classroom," Oxford, Ehrman, and Lavine discuss possible consequences of a mismatch between the ways teacher and student approach learning. Their suggested responses to such incompatibility include changes in scheduling, curriculum, classroom structure, and behavior of teacher and/or student. The first challenge is thus deciding which direction to follow.

For many teaching problems, the chosen path of curricular reform involves revising course goals and articulating them with the goals of preceding and subsequent courses. In her provocative article, "Articulating Learning in High School and College Programs: Holistic Theory in the Foreign Language Curriculum," Swaffar challenges us to reexamine and ultimately reject traditional views about how language is taught in college, to unite high school to undergraduate and graduate curricula through a holistic pedagogical framework anchored in a broad definition of language competence.

An example of improved high school-university articulation is presented by Barnes, Klee, and Wakefield, who describe the University of Minnesota experience of reorganizing the language program to meet proficiency goals. Such reorganization poses particular problems for the course director and teaching assistants: yet, as the authors point out, it may have positive effects in student motivation and achievement and in student and colleague respect for language teaching.

In another article about program revision toward proficiency goals, "Team Teaching French with Teaching Assistants," Braun and Robb report on a curricular experiment at the University of Delaware. Motivated by a desire to provide French students with varied voices and teaching styles, the program teamed teaching assistants and part-time instructors with faculty members in the first three courses of language instruction. The authors report that such teaming stimulated cooperation and sharing among faculty, teaching assistants, and part-timers and thereby strengthened articulation between courses. Their experience thus offers a model for responding to the need for varied teaching styles, as signaled by Oxford, Ehrman, and Lavine, and to challenges of articulation discussed by Swaffar.

In his intriguing research study, Loughrin-Sacco offers insights into yet another pervasive pedagogical and administrative problem of the beginning language classroom: combining "true" beginners and "false" beginners. His data show that the presence of more confident and more verbal false beginners in introductory French classes intimidates true

beginners, increasing the latters' anxiety and most likely inhibiting their ability to learn. Clearly a challenge for the 1990s is to find administrative solutions to alleviate this pedagogical problem; Loughrin-Sacco suggests several possibilities.

Another challenge facing administrators in particular is how to provide a truly *academic* environment for the course director, which will enhance the director's scholarly productivity as well as support the language program. Lee and VanPatten correctly point out that many faculty who supervise language courses are allowed to slip into situations where they unfortunately become overly engaged in departmental service, to the serious detriment of their scholarly pursuits. Following numerous calls to rectify this situation, most institutions are now highly sensitive to the problem. Lee and VanPatten propose an innovative route toward a solution.

Following these six articles, the volume offers two articles that consider teaching assistant preparation. Murphy outlines five areas of competency in which future faculty will need professional training in order to meet the teacher standards now being advocated: language proficiency, culture, linguistics, literature, and methodology. From Murphy's substantial list of required knowledge and abilities, it is clear that many institutions that prepare teaching assistants for college faculty positions should re-examine the breadth and depth of their programs. One of many interesting possibilities suggested by Murphy is to offer teaching assistants/graduate students a second graduate methodology course in order to ensure their exposure to important theoretical and practical notions that could not be adequately discussed in the introductory course.

In "Advancing the Case for an Advanced Methods Course," Lalande offers concrete suggestions and a bibliography for such a second methodology course. He bases his discussion on a pilot course in which he brought together high school teachers and university teaching assistants, providing an opportunity to foster the mutual understanding that underlies strong articulation between secondary and postsecondary programs. Clearly, in broadening the experiences in teaching assistant preparation, we respond to two challenges for the future: producing highly competent teachers and creating more coherent sequences of language instruction.

The final two articles in the volume consider instructional materials, often the primary vehicles to shape curriculum and structure teaching. In "Bridging the Gap Between Teaching and Learning: A Critical Look at Foreign Language Textbooks," Schulz bemoans the fact that our recent innovations in methodology have not yet been reflected in our

materials. From her examination of current theories of second language acquisition and how they suggest ways to encourage classroom interaction to maximize learning, she concludes that the time has come to abandon the notion of a textbook in favor of an integrated package of both authentic and pedagogical materials in a variety of media forms.

Perhaps the potentially most useful, yet least used, media forms today are computer and video technology. In "CALL Today: Implications for the Multisectioned Language Programs," Ariew reviews the state of the art in these two key areas, offering valuable explanations, information, and references for the novice as well as the somewhat experienced user. The breadth of this article represents the magnitude of the challenge we now face: new materials are needed to help our students meet more demanding and varied learning goals. Providing teaching assistants with experience teaching with computer and video technology is yet another task we clearly must undertake in the next decade.

The authors of this first volume of *Issues in Language Program Direction* identify new directions for college foreign language education in the 1990s, challenges to be met not only by the directors who run language programs and the teaching assistants who provide much of the instruction, but by *all* faculty and administrators involved in foreign language teaching. Forward vision is, of course, enhanced by a firm understanding of the past. To help readers benefit from current knowledge, we close this volume with Benseler and Cronjaeger's extensive bibliography of scholarship on the preparation and support of foreign language teaching assistants. Their 377 entries provide a solid beginning for a data base on the improvement of postsecondary foreign language programs. Building and maintaining this data base is yet another challenge to which this series hopes to respond in the years to come.

The 1990s offer a period of renewal and exploration for foreign language instruction. It is the hope of AAUSC that *Issues in Language Program Direction* will contribute, throughout this decade and beyond, to our understanding of second language acquisition, to the development of our undergraduate programs, where we attempt to apply this understanding to classroom practice, and to the preparation of our future colleagues.

Sally Sieloff Magnan
Editor

Style Wars: Teacher-Student Style Conflicts in the Language Classroom

Rebecca L. Oxford, University of Alabama
Madeline E. Ehrman, Foreign Service Institute
Roberta Z. Lavine, University of Maryland

Introduction

This article considers language learning styles—the general approaches used by language learners—and potential conflicts between learning styles and teaching styles. The purposes of this article are (a) to present key concepts and research related to language learning style, (b) to highlight the importance of teacher-student style conflicts and show two scenarios of such difficulties, and (c) to discuss management of teacher-student style mismatches, with particular attention to ways to handle these problems most effectively in single-section and multisection courses. Throughout this article, when we refer to "teacher" we are also including teaching assistants who work in university settings as well as individuals who have made language teaching their profession. In some instances, we will specifically address the particular situations encountered by teaching assistants.

Key Concepts in Learning Style and Teaching Style

The term *language learning style* refers to the person's general approach to language learning. At least twenty dimensions of learning style have been identified in various settings (Parry, 1984; Shipman & Shipman, 1985; Oxford, 1990a, 1990c). Learning style is pervasive (Willing, 1988) and is a mixture of cognitive, affective, and behavioral elements (Ehrman & Oxford, 1988, 1989, 1990).[1] Cognitive elements include preferred or habitual patterns of mental functioning. In the affective dimension, learning style reflects patterns of attitudes and interests that influence what an individual will pay most attention to in a learning situation. From the standpoint of behavior, learning style relates to a tendency to seek situations compatible with one's own learning patterns. When left to their own devices and if not overly pressured by their environment to use a certain set of learning strategies (specific behaviors), students typically use learning strategies that reflect their basic learning styles (Ehrman, 1989, 1990a, 1990b; Ehrman & Oxford, 1988, 1989, 1990; Lawrence, 1984).

Individual learners have a composite of related style characteristics.[2] For example, students with a *global* learning style will usually choose holistic strategies such as guessing, searching for the main idea, engaging in social conversation without having to know all the words, and being sensitive to the social-emotional content of a given interaction. In contrast, an *analytic* student will probably prefer strategies that involve dissecting words and sentences into their component parts and analyzing the structure of the new language in detail.

A *thinking-focused* student is not readily concerned with social and emotional subtleties, except possibly as data for understanding a particular problem. If a student is *feeling-oriented*, he or she is likely to be very sensitive to the feelings of others and to the emotional climate of the environment of the classroom.

An *intuitive* learner will try to build a mental model of the target language; this kind of student deals best with the "big picture" in a nonlinear, random-access mode. Conversely, a *sensing* student may prefer language learning materials and techniques (such as flash cards and Total Physical Response) that involve combinations of movement, sound, sight, and touch and that can be applied in a sequential, linear manner.

A student with a *closure-oriented* ("judging") style is likely to plan language study sessions carefully and do lessons on time or early. To avoid the ambiguity that such a student hates, he or she will sometimes

jump to hasty conclusions about language rules, conversational intent, or cultural norms. A student whose style is more *open* ("perceiving") than closure-seeking may approach the new language as though it were an entertaining game to play. This type of student usually has a high tolerance for ambiguity, does not worry about comprehending everything, and does not feel the need to come to rapid conclusions about the way the language works. Finishing assignments on time is not a natural priority.

Notice how some of the characteristics of these different kinds of students overlap from one person to another. For instance, both the global and the intuitive student display a love of breadth, but the global student applies it directly in social functioning while the intuitive student uses it to create a grand mental design of the new language.

These brief examples illustrate the multiplicity of stylistic dimensions (and corresponding strategies) present in learners. The same varieties of style dimensions are active in teachers as well. Because students and teachers operate in the same classroom environment, conflicts between teaching styles and learning styles may create serious difficulties that may hinder or slow down learning. This article will address such conflicts between students and teachers in detail. As a prelude, we will provide some information on existing research on two major style dimensions for language learning.

Comments on the Two Most Important Style Dimensions for Language Learning

There are two style dimensions that we consider to be the most significant for language learning. The first of these dimensions, *analytic vs. global* processing, appears to be uniquely important and seems to underlie, or at least relate strongly to, a number of other dimensions.[3]

Each of the dimensions associated with analytic vs. global processing can be viewed as a continuum, rather than as a dichotomy. That is, each contains not only the extreme points (which tend to be highlighted in the research) but also a wide range of in-between points, which allows individuals to have some aspects of analytic functioning and some aspects of global functioning (though one usually predominates). Individuals may operate at different points on the continuum for each of the component dimensions, thus making detailed analysis of learning style potentially a highly complex undertaking.

The second major dimension is based on *sensory/perceptual* preference (visual, auditory, tactile, kinesthetic, or a combination of two or more of these). Because of the many aspects of this dimension, it cannot

be viewed as a continuum in the same way that the analytic vs. global dimension can be described, although an individual may have multiple (and situationally determined) sensory/perceptual preferences.

Analytic Processing vs. Global Processing and Their Likely Correlates

The distinction between analytic and global processing seems to be the basis of many other style dimensions, such as field independence vs. field dependence and left-brain vs. right-brain hemisphericity.[4] Table 1 shows how these dimensions may be related to each other.

Table 1
Analytic Processing vs. Global Processing and Their Likely Correlates

ANALYTIC	GLOBAL
Field independence	Field dependence
Left-brain hemisphericity	Right-brain hemisphericity
Sharpening of detail	Leveling of detail
Reflection	Impulsivity
Thinking (MBTI)	Feeling (MBTI)
Sensing (MBTI)	Intuition (MBTI)
Introversion (MBTI)	Extraversion (MBTI)
Judging (MBTI)	Perceiving (MBTI)
Intolerance of ambiguity	Tolerance of ambiguity

Note: This table does not indicate an exact correspondence among the characteristics listed on the left side, nor an exact correspondence among the characteristics listed on the right side. However, there seems to be a degree of interrelationship among the traits listed in each column. In this table, MBTI refers to dimensions found on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

Little foreign or second language research has been conducted directly on analytic vs. global processing, but some indirect hints exist about the probable salience of this dimension. For example, one study suggests that analytic learners might have better grammatical competence than their global peers (Politzer, 1983). *Sharpening of detail in long-*

term memory—a stylistic trait that seems very analytic to us—was found by Parry (1984) to be related to language learning success in conventional language classrooms; its opposite, *leveling or blurring of detail in long-term memory*, a globalizing style, was not helpful. These findings suggest that style dissonance between global teachers and analytic students (or vice versa) might include conflicts over the grammar area, particularly in terms of dealing with specific grammatical details.

Field independence vs. field dependence has received considerable research attention in the language learning area and elsewhere, much more than the underlying analytic vs. global processing dimension which it seems to represent (Kogan, 1971).[5] On tests involving embedded figures, field independent learners easily separate key details from a complex or confusing background, while their field dependent peers who find this analytic task difficult tend to be more adept than field independent learners in social, globally oriented situations (Witkin & Berry, 1975; Witkin & Goodenough, 1977). Field independent learners show significant advantages over field dependent learners in certain discrete-point or analytic tasks in their own native language. However, results have been mixed regarding an advantage for field independent individuals in foreign language learning (see reviews by Oxford, 1990a, 1990c; Parry, 1984).[6] Style conflicts regarding field independence in the language classroom might center on the amount of linguistic detail the individual processes.

The analytic vs. global processing dimension is also tapped, if only indirectly, in studies of *brain hemisphericity*. The left hemisphere of the brain deals with language sequentially through analysis and abstraction, while the right hemisphere recognizes language as more global patterns, either auditory or visual (Willing, 1988). Learners who prefer the kind of processing conducted by the left hemisphere deal more easily with grammatical structure and contrastive analysis, while right-brain learners are more adept at learning intonation and rhythms of the target language. Hemispherically balanced (integrated) people were found in a small-sample study to perform well as learners of foreign languages in a communicatively oriented language program in which accuracy is also important (Leaver, 1986). Hemisphericity research is at a very early stage, and we should not yet rely on it completely. However, we can easily imagine the mismatch between a "right-brained" teacher and a "left-brained" student, with the first excited about the musical patterns or social context of the language and the latter trying to develop highly analytic control of syntactic items.

Reflection vs. impulsivity is also likely to relate to the analytic vs. global distinction. Reflection involves systematic, often analytic, inves-

tigation of hypotheses and is usually associated with accurate performance. Impulsivity is the quick and uncritical acceptance of initially selected hypotheses — the fast-inaccurate style. Other possibilities are fast-accurate (always preferred but not so typically achieved) and slow-inaccurate (the worst case). Reflection is desirable when there is inadequate information or insufficient experience for fast-accurate processing. In some foreign language research in conventional, grammar-based classrooms, reflective subjects (as identified by tests of matching familiar figures) perform much more effectively than impulsive subjects (Parry, 1984). This is understandable because reflection is helpful whenever accuracy rather than fluency is the main goal. An obvious conflict might arise when the teacher is reflective, carefully thinking before speaking, and the student is impulsive, blurting out inaccurate responses. The reverse problem might occur when the teacher is impulsive and expects rapid responses, even if inaccurate, and the student is more reticent due to greater reflectivity.

In a communicative setting, analysis and reflection might not provide as much advantage as in traditional classrooms. In a set of ongoing investigations involving a personality model realized by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI, Myers & McCaulley, 1985) in a long-term, communicative, intensive foreign language program (Ehrman, 1989, 1990a, 1990b; Ehrman & Oxford, 1988, 1989, 1990), we have found that *thinking-type* students, who showed characteristics that seem to resemble reflectivity — analyzing not just the language but also their own language performance in great detail — could be hindered by this tendency. Some of the strongly analytic, thinking-oriented students were very self-critical; their communicative language performance was harmed by over-reliance on negative reflection.[7]

On the MBTI, thinking is contrasted not with an analogue of impulsivity, but with a value-based approach to coming to conclusions, called "feeling." *Feeling-type* people, who tended to be more socially attuned than their analytically oriented colleagues, often performed better on the highly communicative tasks in their program. Conflicts between thinking teachers, who prefer analysis and tend to be critical, and feeling students, who are socially oriented and disrupted by criticism, are easy to find in the language classroom; and the reverse kinds of conflicts are also found in abundance.

In the Ehrman-Oxford studies, another MBTI dimension, *sensing vs. intuition*, also appears related to analytical vs. global processing. Sensing-type people in intensive language training showed great practical interest in facts and details, which might be viewed as analytical components of the whole language. They made choices by following a clearly definable

series of steps in a serial-processing mode. Many such learners disliked guessing strategies that involved ambiguity; the concrete, hands-on orientation of these learners is linked to a desire for unambiguous, structured stimuli. (Language learners who are less tolerant of ambiguity generally perform less well on communicative language tasks than those who are more tolerant of ambiguity; see, e.g., Chapelle, 1983; Chapelle & Roberts, 1986).

On the other hand, intuitives in the Ehrman-Oxford studies were much more global, searching for general patterns and broad meanings rather than attending to small details. They preferred a random-access, parallel-processing mode of learning as though they owned the entire "language territory" from the start and did not have to inch their way along. They liked guessing strategies and were not upset by ambiguity. The conflict between sensing teachers and intuitive learners—or the reverse—is likely to focus on issues such as sequencing of lessons and tolerance for ambiguity. Conflicts in the degree of ambiguity tolerance are also highlighted in the results for *judging vs. perceiving* individuals in the Ehrman-Oxford studies; the judgers needed rapid closure and sometimes performed worse in language learning, while the perceivers needed more openness and tended to perform better. Research by Budner (1962) cited in Myers and McCaulley (1985) links MBTI perceiving and tolerance of ambiguity.[8]

Sensory/Perceptual Preferences

Sensory/perceptual preference refers to the sensory modality with which the learner is most comfortable and through which most perception is channeled for that individual. Little research has been done on language students' sensory/perceptual preferences (visual, auditory, tactile, kinesthetic, or a combination of senses), although every teacher has probably heard students describe a preference for seeing or hearing material. Disparities between an individual student's sensory/perceptual preference and that of his or her teacher are very easy to find in the language classroom, e.g., a highly auditory teacher might deny a very visual learner the use of written input when introducing new material. The difficulties mount when learners in the classroom have different sensory/perceptual preferences from each other as well as from the teacher.

Reid (1987) studied sensory preferences of ESL learners and found that those preferences were strongly influenced by national origin; for instance, Koreans were the most visual in their preferences. ESL students' choice of academic and career specialization was also related to their sensory preferences. In a different discussion, Semple (1982) suggests

that children might progress from the kinesthetic sense to the visual, with auditory preference constituting a possible later development.

Sensory/perceptual preference may even be related to analytic vs. global style and its correlates, according to recent research using an expanded version of the MBTI and a fine-grained analysis of its structure. This research has uncovered a relationship between introversion (which was possibly related to analysis) and the preference for visual input, and a parallel relationship between extraversion (which may be tied to globality) and the preference for auditory input (Saunders, 1987).

Particularly in the language learning area, sensory/perceptual preference is tremendously important. Battles over teaching methods are often strongly related to the issue of sensory/perceptual preference. For instance, proponents of grammar-translation are often those who prefer visual learning; advocates of audiolingualism stress the primacy of aural/oral learning; and the Communicative Approach fosters multisensory learning. However, some proponents of each method seem to be unaware of this important sensory/perceptual basis of their pedagogical skirmishes.

The publishing industry is beginning to address the notion that language learners have different learning styles based on sensory preferences. Therefore, publishers are now developing beautiful, multimedia packages. We urge researchers to provide more data on what students actually need based on a comprehensive assessment of their sensory/perceptual preferences. Those who train teachers and teaching assistants need to make varied materials available and show how those materials can be used to best effect.

Different Styles for Different Settings and Purposes

We are fairly certain that one particular style may be more functional in one setting than in another. For instance, Oxford and Nyikos (1989) and Nyikos and Oxford (submitted for publication) found that analytically prone students were more prevalent, and therefore probably more comfortable, in a higher education setting where memorizing and grammatical analysis were the norm. The Ehrman-Oxford studies (Ehrman, 1989, 1990a, 1990b; Ehrman & Oxford, 1988, 1989, 1990; Oxford & Ehrman, 1988) discovered advantages for socially oriented, feeling-type adult learners compared to analytical, thinking-type learners in an intensive, communicative language instruction program.

In view of these findings, it is possible that communicatively oriented activities advocated by current methodologies may be difficult for some

learners. For these students, school experiences have been dominated by the more traditional analytic approach and have allowed only limited exposure to the global mode. Such students, no matter what their initial style preferences, may experience "cognitive dissonance" when placed in a communicative situation that demands a global style. Similarly, many who proclaim their inability to learn foreign languages may have strong global preferences that put them at a great disadvantage in traditional high school or college classrooms. In other learning settings, they might have bloomed.

In order to address more evenly the varied learning styles illuminated by research, it is important to balance the excellent communicative and globally oriented activities which many texts now suggest, and activities that accommodate the needs of more analytic or field independent learners (e.g., tasks which require logic and serial processing). These latter activities need not be dull and could include story rebuilding (which requires logic and serial processing) or word searches (which accommodate field independence). Non-closure-seekers and intuitives, who can cope with ambiguity and do not need to feel completely in control, may be more likely than closure-seekers to adapt well to naturalistic learning settings. Such learners often do not require a step-by-step, linear progression in learning but can be comfortable with the more haphazard progression that characterizes immersion programs, living in the country of the target language, or any other communicative experience. (See also Ehrman, 1990b, for more discussion of this theme.) Traditional language training should consider their learning style, just as communicative approaches must meet the needs of the analytic learner.

Certainly much more research needs to be conducted on which learning styles operate most effectively in different settings and for different language learning purposes. Additional research is essential to determine just how much individual learners can adapt their styles to fit the materials, methods, and intensity of a given instructional program, and to what degree the program (which generally reflects the policies and priorities of its sponsoring institution) should try to adapt to the stylistic preferences of individual learners.

Teaching Styles and Their Possible Conflict with Learning Styles

The importance of teaching style has been highlighted by recent research and theory. Teaching styles can be described in the same terms we have used for learning styles, such as analytic vs. global; the MBTI dimensions

of thinking vs. feeling, sensing vs. intuition, judging vs. perceiving, and introversion vs. extraversion (see Myers & McCaulley, 1985, pp. 133-36); intolerant vs. tolerant of ambiguity; constricted vs. flexible in thinking; and visual, auditory, tactile, kinesthetic, or some combination.[9] Earlier in this article we have briefly speculated on a number of possible conflicts between teacher's style and learner's style.

Teachers tend to mirror their own learning preferences in the teaching approaches they bring to the language classroom, unless these are overridden by the way they themselves were taught. This is particularly true for teaching assistants, if they receive little formal training in methods before they start to teach.

Choices of more general instructional methodologies are affected by teachers' learning styles. For example, an intuitive-perceiver (global) teacher is likely to be drawn to a seemingly unstructured approach like Community Language Learning, which is based on Counseling-Learning principles. A sensing-judger (relatively analytic) may be repelled by the apparent lack of structure in this approach.

Similarly, instructional techniques are influenced by teacher style. For example, the teacher who has a global learning style may favor such activities as open-ended, oral role-plays or jigsaw listening, frown on the use of the blackboard, and enjoy a classroom characterized by "organized chaos." In contrast, the analytical instructor may enjoy the systematic presentation of difficult points and patterns, follow a detailed plan for classroom practice involving incremental steps, and use analytic error correction.

Little friction exists as long as students share their teacher's style preference. However, problems may arise when the teacher's style differs from an individual student's style, or from the stylistic tendency of a group of students. Learners who exhibit a style preference different from the teacher's may be plagued by constant anxiety and react negatively to the teacher, the environment, and the subject matter. (For research on language learning anxiety, see Ehrman, 1989, 1990a; Horwitz & Young, 1991; and Young, submitted for publication.) Academic success in a particular course is also likely to be linked to the style match or mismatch: students whose learning style matches the teacher's style are more likely to achieve good grades than those whose styles are in opposition to the instructor. (Studies to this effect are cited for the MBTI in Myers & McCaulley, 1985).

There are many parallels between the teacher-learner conflict mentioned above and the problems likely to plague supervisors (or course directors) of teaching assistants, on the one hand, and teaching assistants on the other hand. For instance, those teaching assistants who

share the supervisor's style preference will feel comfortable in their working relationship with their supervisor. It is probable that these teaching assistants will enjoy open and supportive communication with their supervisor, participate actively in the program, implement the activities suggested by the supervisor, successfully use the materials provided, and have the confidence to give free rein to their own creativity. In contrast, when teaching assistants and supervisors do not share style preferences, their relationship will probably be plagued by negative feelings. This scene is all too common: teaching assistants cannot understand their supervisor's methods; they feel alienated, complain of lack of support and tolerance, and find it difficult to follow the suggested program. The supervisor, in turn, feels frustrated at the teaching assistants' unwillingness to use the materials provided and to complete any necessary assignments.

Such a conflict could also have far-reaching impact on the evaluation process. Teaching assistants who share the supervisor's style, and therefore teach in a manner similar to the supervisor, might receive better evaluations than those instructors whose methods are dissimilar. Although such actions are undoubtedly unintentional, supervisors must be sensitized to potential style conflicts. They must reevaluate their criteria to ensure that ratings—both excellent and poor—are truly based on the performance of the individual teaching assistant, and not rooted in their own unconscious expectations, which reflect their personal learning and teaching style.

It is worth noting that the opposite can also occur. Supervisors and teachers can make constructive use of their differences to mutual benefit. Such a situation is documented for intuitive supervisors and sensing-type teachers in Ehrman (1990b).

Two Scenarios of Teacher-Student Style Mismatches

We now present two prototypical scenarios of possible conflicts: first, a global teacher in conflict with analytic, sensing, and closure-seeking students; second, an analytic teacher mismatched with global, open, and intuitive students. We have chosen to focus on these style disparities because they seem to be the most common and probably the most important. Keep in mind that we are presenting the hypothetical extremes of the continua for purposes of contrast, rather than the less dramatic "gray areas." (Unfortunately, the extremes can and do occur rather frequently in language classrooms.) We have also tried to include some problematic aspects related to sensory/perceptual preferences, because,

as discussed earlier, these preferences may be related to the analytic vs. global dimension.

This semester the Language Department has two sections of Language 101. The students register by computer and are unaware of which teacher will teach any particular section. Therefore it is very likely that in any given class there will be some gross teaching-learning style mismatches and some clear style congruities. We will now examine how the students might react when placed in each of the two representative sections of Language 101.

Section 1: Global Teacher

Section 1 is taught by an extremely global teacher, known here as "Instructor G." She (gender is hypothetical here) is an extraverted and feeling-type individual, socially aware and attuned to the feelings and opinions of others. She is a perceiver and therefore enjoys exploring various options for all tasks, without requiring a high degree of classroom structure. In her view, cooperation both in and out of the classroom is more productive and desirable than competition.

Based on these preferences, it is not surprising that Instructor G favors a global approach to learning and teaching that is evident in many aspects of the class. For instance, she sees the development of language proficiency as the primary classroom goal, and to this end she consistently uses open-ended, communicative activities such as oral role-plays, games, and story creation. She conducts her class in a lively manner and expects students to participate actively. Lesson plans are changed to meet changing circumstances, rather than being established and adhered to. Instructor G constantly tries to show the "big picture" of the language by integrating the four language skills (reading, writing, speaking, and listening) in classroom activities. For example, she asks students to listen for and check off main words mentioned in a listening passage about a family from the native country of the target language. She then requests that students orally recreate the central idea by using the main words as focal points. This task is followed by a vocabulary-building activity using problematic words from the listening passage. Students are then asked to carry out a small-group task to write a story about an imaginary family somewhat different from the one presented in the passage and to design a family tree for this new family. The small groups exchange and correct each other's written stories before they are acted out in role-plays. All four language skills are integrated in this cluster of interrelated activities. Instructor G is flexible and has a high tolerance for ambiguity. She encourages students to take conversational risks and express themselves in the target language most or all of the

time. She corrects errors only when they hinder communication and makes a special effort to praise even the weakest students for their attempts to communicate. She enjoys activities which challenge students to express their creativity and which have no single correct answers, e.g., writing a wish list of possible birthday presents and reacting to a video depicting mimed vignettes.

Her favorite media are auditory, tactile, and kinesthetic; she is not as interested in visual learning, and she uses it only insofar as it supports the other senses. She employs videos when they have a lot of oral speech, but more often she uses songs, oral word games, jazz chants, and other kinds of auditory activities. She encourages the use of Total Physical Response activities and tasks which require students to move around the room. She also enjoys integrating other sensory tasks into the classroom whenever possible: guessing games involving different senses and audiomotor tasks.[10]

She rarely uses the blackboard, because she dislikes turning away from students and losing eye contact with them. To get the point across, she prefers to use real objects or overhead transparencies, along with extensive, simultaneous oral/aural input.

Instructor G chooses materials that reflect her global style. She selects readings that present general rather than detailed information, or give various viewpoints rather than offering an in-depth examination of only one perspective. Her tests allow for several correct answers and require students to express their own personal ideas (e.g., completing a partial conversation, choosing an appropriate title, summarizing a story).[11]

The students react to the class in different ways based on their learning style preferences. The global, intuitive, and open students really like Instructor G's style and feel very comfortable in the class, because the teacher's style fits closely with elements of their own learning preferences. The sensing student is enthusiastic about the multimedia approach but thinks the teacher is not doing her job well, because she does not sequence her points but instead moves in and out in a random-access way.

A number of the analytic and closure-seeking students are distraught in Instructor G's class, which they find confusing and nonproductive. They both long for a more traditional, more structured classroom and believe in the mottoes, "No pain, no gain" and "If you're having fun, you must not be learning." Role-plays and "free production" activities are anxiety-laden for them. If introverted, they would do better if they had time at home to prepare some of their communications rather than being expected to deliver everything spontaneously and quickly. Many would like highly structured activities, e.g. pattern drills, directed dialogues,

slash sentences, and reading for precise information.

The analytic student complains that the teacher's rapid-fire oral questions and answers deal with generalizations and do not address issues systematically or seriously. This student wants a more defined focus and more opportunity to use logic. To this learner, Instructor G's grammar presentations seem chaotic and are not didactic enough. Moreover, in other classes this learner relies heavily on the blackboard and the printed text for logical and organized input. There is simply not enough visual input of *any* kind to meet the analytic student's needs.

For the closure-seeker, the high level of ambiguity and flexibility characterizing Instructor G's lessons (especially in creating commercials spontaneously, giving advice, and expressing opinions) creates mental confusion and does not allow sufficient closure.

Even Instructor G's efforts to address their emotional concerns clash with analytic and closure-seeking styles. The teacher often conducts group awareness activities or asks that students share information from their language learning diaries or emotional checklists,[12] all activities that these students may consider personally invasive.

In short, analytic and closure-seeking students are very unhappy in Instructor G's section of Language 101, and their grades in this class are not up to par with their excellent performance in their major-subject classes, in which their learning styles are more compatible with both the subject and the teacher's style.

Unless the brewing conflict in this classroom is addressed, Section 1 of Language 101 is likely to end in failure, mediocre performance, or discouragement for perhaps half of the class, plus disappointment for the teacher.

Further conflict would be probable if Instructor G were a teaching assistant under the supervision of an inflexibly analytically oriented course director. Not only would the course materials be largely based on analysis, but the supervisor would be likely to judge Instructor G's teaching performance based on analytic instructional criteria that do not relate to the instructor's own global objectives or style.

Section 2: Analytic Teacher

"Instructor A," the extremely analytic teacher, teaches Section 2 of Language 101. He (again, gender is hypothetical) is a rather quiet man who shies away from many social situations; his actions characterize him as a thinker and as a reflective person. He has a love of detail, and all his work is thorough, well-organized, and carefully documented. The depth of his knowledge often astonishes his colleagues.

In many ways he typifies the analytical processor. Like his global

colleague described earlier, Instructor A's learning and teaching style is reflected in the classroom environment he creates. In agreement with Instructor G, Instructor A believes that communicative competence is the primary goal, although he sees it as much farther off than she does. In contrast with Instructor G, he also believes that an in-depth understanding of the complexities of the language is valuable in and of itself.

Although both instructors want their students to learn to communicate, the methods they use, consistent with their predominant styles, are very different. Instructor A favors a detailed and logical presentation of material. He likes to emphasize contrastive elements and the development of grammatical competence. He distrusts open-ended activities such as simulations or spontaneous creation of original summaries without sufficient groundwork laid in advance. Instructor A does not feel the desire for constant social interaction and limits the use of paired and group activities. He tries to address all the language skills in his class, but sequentially rather than in integrated exercises. In addition, Instructor A frequently uses materials such as word finds or hidden pictures that field independent learners like.

Instructor A always plans a definite sequence of activities well in advance and stays with his plan. For example, a typical class would include a detailed explanation of a particular grammar point, with appropriate examples on the blackboard written in a clear and legible hand, displaying an orderly sense of space. The presentation would be followed by several activities from the text, moving slowly from discrete-point items to personalized practice (e.g., substitutions, cloze passages, and slash sentences). The sequence is carefully designed in a linear fashion, leading students from a highly controlled to a less controlled use of the language.

In contrast to the global Instructor G, Instructor A's thinking patterns are very focused. He likes his students to speak correctly and always provides ample time for them to reflect and formulate answers. He is not apt to stop an activity in midstream to relate the exercise to the students' personal experience. Instead, he is likely to finish the assignment and only then extrapolate. Similarly, he rarely does an activity without completing it; if an exercise is not successful, he still tends to persevere until closure is reached, carefully noting how to modify the task for future use.

While Instructor G uses a multisensory approach, Instructor A focuses mainly on visual input and rarely exploits the other senses. He wonders if methods and tasks requiring motion (e.g., Total Physical Response, language games, autograph tasks, and certain role plays) are too chaotic to be effective.

His tests and assignments also reflect his general style: he favors discrete-point test items and tries to avoid more global types of testing. He is concerned that tests of communicative competence are altogether too subjective, and he believes that existing proficiency guidelines are neither objective nor analytic enough to be easily and meaningfully implemented in the classroom. He especially likes multiple-choice and completion items that have only one correct answer because of his great regard for the truth as he sees it: unambiguous. He is careful and precise in grading tests and compositions, and he almost always returns assignments quickly.

As we know, the analytic, closure-seeking, and sensing students were very unhappy in Instructor G's section of Language 101. Exactly the opposite is true of such students when they are in Instructor A's section. Sharing various elements of Instructor A's style, these students find the logic, organization, incremental progression, and closure they need for successful language learning. Everything is clear and methodical, and the step-by-step approach is what they desire. Unlike their fellows in Instructor G's class, these students do not feel bombarded with confusing, spontaneous, and constant stimuli. The sensing students might like more of a multisensory approach, but other than that they find Instructor A to be far more allied to their own styles than Instructor G.

Instructor A creates a predictable, secure, and stable environment that is essential for many of his students. Because they know exactly what is expected of them, some of Instructor A's students are freed from the necessity of "psyching" him out and can focus on the learning task more readily.

In Instructor A's class, it is now the global, intuitive, and open students who are frustrated and upset about their language learning progress. These learners find themselves in direct opposition to most elements of their teacher's style. Without the openness, the spontaneity, the social interaction, and the multiple perspectives characteristic of their learning styles, these students feel deprived of stimulation. The picture is clear: global, intuitive, and open learners—representing roughly half the class—are now at risk emotionally and academically. They are just as disadvantaged in Instructor A's class as were the analytic, closure-seeking, and sensing students in Instructor G's section.

However, Instructor A is likely to encounter less direct resistance from these students than Instructor G faced from his stylistic opposites. Most students, even those who find Instructor A's style very uncomfortable, have been conditioned by their previous learning experiences to expect an analytic, sequential teaching style.

If Instructor A were a teaching assistant under a globally oriented

supervisor, he would have severe conflicts with the supervisor in terms of approach, materials, and evaluation of performance. These difficulties might taint the professional relationship unless their stylistic roots were recognized and handled effectively.

Comments on Teacher-Student Style Mismatch

The scenarios above have been somewhat simplified by examples that represent the extremes on certain style continua, because we needed to make a clear and unambiguous point about teacher-student style conflict. Many real-life classrooms may not be too different from what we have portrayed above, although numbers and types of students may differ somewhat. Most people have heard of actual instances of the "divided class," in which half the class seems to know exactly what is going on, and the other half is lost.

Individuals, whether they are teachers or students or both, can be placed in continual conflict regarding style. Such conflicts can appear in disagreements about many things: optimal educational environment; preferred types of activities, resources, and material; techniques for dealing with affective concerns, grading criteria, and testing methods; and difficulties with supervisors and teaching assistants in multisection language courses. Consequences might include student apathy and teacher negativism, among others.[13]

Managing Teacher-Student Style Conflicts

What can be done when such a mismatch occurs between teacher-student style? How can the teacher or supervisor effectively address the potential problems caused by such a mismatch? The following are some possibilities:

1. Changes in the Curriculum. As suggested by Mosston and Ashworth (1990), in the face of teacher-student style conflicts, *lessons can be organized as a series of episodes, each of which has a different objective and a different style*, with the teaching style (or, more accurately, the teaching-learning style) chosen that best matches the objective. As part of the training of teachers and teaching assistants, supervisors could not only instruct them in how to create such modules, but also work with them to identify the dominant style of numerous language tasks. For example, in the language learning classroom a grammar task might require an analytical style, but a listening task might use a global style. Teachers can help learners use different styles associated with diverse objectives.

2. Changes in the Teacher. Teachers can do more than merely orient teaching styles to the demands of different tasks; *they can actively adapt teaching styles to the existing, favored styles of their learners.* This

adaptation targets the needs of groups of students, each group having a different predominant style. It is true that teachers, like students, tend to operate based on the style that is most comfortable for them. However, teachers can learn to become more flexible and teach some parts of every lesson employing the opposite style, so as to meet the needs of students whose style is very different from theirs.

Supervisors of teaching assistants can facilitate this process by first helping the assistants to identify their individual styles and to use simple instruments or observations to assess the dominant styles of their own students. During training courses, teaching assistants could be provided with opportunities to experiment with lessons designed and implemented according to their particular teaching preferences (and in conflict with their preferences). A further step would be for the supervisor to work with instructors to develop alternative models for specific areas of difficulty. For teaching assistants, especially those who are inexperienced, simply identifying students' styles is not enough; hands-on experience is essential to facilitate the transition from a single perspective to a multifaceted approach.

In addition, new teachers or teaching assistants, often struggling with the problems of maintaining discipline and gaining respect in the multisection classroom, must be made aware that flexibility does not mean lack of backbone: most people function best when they know clearly what their style preferences are; this gives them a solid base from which to experiment with new behaviors and approaches.[14] Thus, for example, teachers who know that they prefer a sequential approach can ensure that their curriculum plans provide for adequate structure, while at the same time incorporating some free-form elements to meet the needs of the more global students.

3. Changes in Classroom Management. The teacher can go so far as to *totally individualize the instruction, in order to provide the kind of learning most favorable to every student's particular style.* This is an extremely ambitious undertaking, involving the preparation of fifteen, twenty, thirty, or more individual "prescriptions" or "lessons" for individual students. Generally, this much teacher adaptation to idiosyncratic student needs is unwarranted, because, as noted earlier, there may be just a few major, underlying dimensions of language learning styles. Furthermore, students need to use learning strategies associated with less preferred style dimensions for maximum learning success (see Ehrman, 1989, 1990a, 1990b; Ehrman & Oxford, 1988, 1989, 1990; also point 4 below).

While total individualization is probably not cost and time-effective in most cases,[15] modules—some for student self-study use—might be

amassed and made available to teachers and teaching assistants. For example, specific areas of difficulty or interest could be identified by the course supervisor. In conjunction with a methods course or supervisory training, instructors could then generate a series of lessons tailored to different learning styles. These could be compiled and shared among the teachers of a particular level, or among all instructors. An alternative would be the development of a variety of content-free models for activities compatible with global, analytic, and sensory learning styles. These models could then serve as points of departure for the teacher or the TA who wants to provide instruction for diverse learning styles.

4. Changes in the Student. *The student(s) can adapt, being taught new stylistic modes so as to cope with any language learning task or situation, and obviate the style conflict.* For instance, a student who hates the audiolingual "mim-mem" (mimicry-memorization) methodology that a given teacher uses can nevertheless pick out some aspect of that methodology that might be useful—such as designing his or her own mental drill-like activities in the midst of real conversation. (See Stevick's (1989) real-life portrayal of the expert learner, "Gwen," doing just this.) A global learner who dislikes analyzing words and phrases and prefers broad inferencing in order to guess meanings might nevertheless learn to use contrastive analysis with success and enjoyment. These possibilities demonstrate that learners can, with effort, stretch their personal capacities and move out of what we might call their "stylistic comfort zone" for the sake of greater versatility in learning.

5. Changes in the Teacher-Student Grouping. *Learners and teachers can be matched by style,* so that, for example, global learners have global teachers, and analytic learners have analytic teachers. The advantage in this is that style conflicts will not arise in the first place and that learning may occur far more efficiently. However, implementation of teacher-student style matching would be a logistical and practical nightmare in most schools and school systems. It also poses certain disadvantages for both learners and teachers. For example, students who are constantly placed with teachers who share their own style will not be able to cope later on with the work world, in which people are put into jobs regardless of style and in which one is expected to deal closely with a variety of people; and they may be unable to deal easily with the different styles found in the target country. In addition, teachers who are accustomed to situations where all learners reflect their personal style will be similarly unprepared to teach in diverse settings with a varied student population. (See also Dunn & Dunn, 1972.)

6. Changes in the Way Style Differences Are Viewed. *Learners and teachers can be helped to use style conflicts as a way to increase their repertoire*

of approaches. Sometimes, but not always, a little stylistic friction is exactly what a student or a group of students—or the teacher—needs in order to grow. It is essential to discuss possible and actual style conflicts in order for them to become a growth experience instead of a barrier to learning. It is up to the teacher to judge and calibrate the timing and amount of such "healthy" conflict.

It is essential that teachers experience firsthand how such conflict can be employed for a positive and advantageous end. Supervisors of teaching assistants can provide this kind of experience by structuring multisectioned courses so that teaching assistants are required to interact with peers who may not share their learning style preferences. Forming task forces to work cooperatively on different instructional tasks (e.g., creating tests, or developing or evaluating materials) is one effective method of creating controlled environments where conflicts are likely to arise and where the supervisor can help participants solve those conflicts. This has been done at the University of Maryland with good results.

7. Changes in Assessment. All of the above options require that *teachers at least, and preferably also students, must be fully aware of their major style preferences; and this necessitates some type of style assessment* (see Oxford, 1990a). Such assessment need not be complicated; teachers and teaching assistants could be assessed during initial training programs. They could also be shown how to determine the styles of their own students.

All available assessment information should then be taken into account in considering class placement, grouping, materials, activities, testing, and other aspects of classroom work. Teacher style will almost certainly influence the specific way the style-mismatch issues are handled. For example, a closure-oriented teacher may wish to formally build different approaches into the curriculum. A more open teacher may prefer to "wing it," improvising to meet the needs of each class without any formal curriculum adaptation. No matter how style disparities are handled, formally or informally, they must indeed be handled and must not be allowed to lurk unattended, causing difficulties for teachers and students.

Conclusions

This article has discussed important research on language learning styles and has presented examples of conflicts in style between the teacher and the learner. The research and practical implications offered here are important for all teachers and learners of foreign and second languages. If our speculations are correct about the two major dimensions named above—analytic vs. global processing, and sensory/per-

ceptual preferences—being the most important for language learning, it is possible to narrow down the range of individual stylistic differences about which teachers need to be concerned initially. This makes it much easier to educate teachers to use style differences constructively.

Notes

1. Language experts sometimes make a distinction between formal, classroom-based "learning" and informal, out-of-class "acquisition" of nonnative language skills. However, the term *language learning style* is applied with great frequency in discussions of second language acquisition. To avoid the double terminology of "language learning and/or acquisition styles," we will use the simpler term "language learning style" in a rather broad way to refer to an individual's general mode of developing target language skills in either a formal or informal setting.
2. Some style characteristics shown in these sketches are based on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, or MBTI (Myers & McCaulley, 1985); these include introversion vs. extraversion, sensing vs. intuition, thinking vs. feeling, and judging vs. perceiving. Other style characteristics treated in this article are founded in various different style models that have gained popularity in cognitive and social psychology.
3. Mainstream psychology is making considerable use of a similar dichotomy. A recent article (Vitz, 1990) compares the work of several authors to treat right-hemisphere processing, analogue cognition, Tucker's syncretic cognition, and narrative thinking in one group (related to global thinking) in contrast with a more analytic-sequential group: left-hemisphere processing, digital cognition, Tucker's analytic cognition, and propositional thinking.
4. Our own ideas about the centrality of analytic vs. global processing are supported by Schmeck's important work (1988), which synthesizes the research on learning styles. Schmeck describes a general learning style continuum (without particular reference to second or foreign language learning). At one pole of the continuum, according to Schmeck and others in that volume, are analytic (focused/detailed) processing, field independence, reflection, narrow categorization, serial-processing, and left-brain dominance—and we would suggest thinking-based decision making, sensing, introversion, intolerance of ambiguity, judging, and constricted thinking. At the other pole, according to Schmeck and his colleagues, are global processing, field dependence, impulsivity, broad categorization, parallel processing, and right-brain dominance, to which we would recommend adding feeling-based decision making, intuition, extraversion, tolerance for ambiguity, perceiving, and flexible thinking.
5. The main instruments related to the field independence vs. dependence dimension actually measure only field independence, with field dependence inferred and operationally defined by the lack of field independence (Brown,

1987; Ehrman, 1989), a negative definition which may reveal a bias in researchers' value systems. "Field sensitivity" is a more balanced term, though it is rarely used.

6. The field independence vs. field dependence dimension has been marked by a significant sex difference, with males tending toward independence and females toward dependence or "sensitivity" (Shipman & Shipman, 1985). This sex difference may be culture-bound (Witkin & Berry, 1975).

7. For more on this topic, see Ehrman & Oxford (1988, 1989, 1990).

8. Aspects of another MBTI scale, *introversion vs. extraversion*, suggest a connection with the analytic vs. global distinction as well. Introverts tend toward reflection; they like time to process before acting and may tune out distractions, especially of an interpersonal nature. On the other hand, extraverts are frequently impulsive, unanalytic, and nonreflective in their style of action. In the Ehrman-Oxford studies, introverts had some advantage, but this finding represents language learning in an intensive, communicative, classroom-based program.

9. Teaching styles have also been classified as directive, authoritative/friendly, cooperative/tolerant, repressive, businesslike, uncertain/drudging, aggressive/uncertain, tolerant/uncertain, and friendly/tolerant by a Dutch research team (Wubbels, Brekelmans, Creton & Hooymayers, 1988); and as command, practice, reciprocal, self-check, inclusion, guided-discovery, convergent-discovery, divergent, learner-designed individualized, learner-initiated, and self-teaching, according to two researchers in the U.S. (Mosston & Ashworth, 1990).

10. See, e.g., Cooper, Kalivoda & Morain (1990).

11. See Omaggio (1986) for a discussion of characteristics of test items and item types.

12. Oxford (1990b) explains in detail these affective techniques.

13. Student-student style conflicts are equally important and are addressed in a separate paper (Lavine, Oxford & Ehrman, forthcoming).

14. MBTI practitioners in particular encourage this view of learning style.

15. In addition to what we consider the crucial style dimensions, which we have examined in this paper, other models of style have affected curriculum planning and classroom management. For instance, the 4MAT curriculum design model (McCarthy, 1980), based on Kolb's four-quadrant learning style model, suggests that teachers orient instruction to all four of Kolb's categories of learning style present in the classroom plus brain hemisphericity. Though we find Kolb's style categories somewhat abstract, nevertheless the idea of providing instructional options for a limited number of major style groups is highly appealing.

Works Cited

Brown, H. Douglas. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1987.

Budner, S. "Intolerance of Ambiguity as a Personality Variable." *Journal of Personality* 30 (1962): 29-50.

Chapelle, Carol A. "The Relationship Between Ambiguity Tolerance and Success in Acquiring English as a Second Language in Adult Learners." Diss., University of Illinois, 1983.

Chapelle, Carol A. & C. Roberts. "Ambiguity Tolerance and Field Independence as Predictors in English as a Second Language." *Language Learning* 36 (1986): 27-45.

Cooper, Thomas, Theodore B. Kalivoda & Genelle Morain. "Learning Foreign Language in High School and College: Should It Really Be Different?" *Shifting the Instructional Focus to the Learner*. Ed. Sally S. Magnan. Middlebury, VT: Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1990: 127-50.

Dunn, Rita S. & K. J. Dunn. "Learning Styles/Teaching Styles: Should They... Can They... Be Matched?" *Educational Leadership* 36 (1972): 238-44.

Ehrman, Madeline E. "Ants and Grasshoppers, Badgers and Butterflies: Qualitative and Quantitative Investigation of Adult Language Learning Styles and Strategies." Diss., The Union Institute, Cincinnati, OH, 1989.

_____. "Owls and Doves: Cognition, Personality, and Learning Success." *Proceedings of the Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1990a, in press.

_____. "The Role of Personality Type in Adult Language Learning: An Ongoing Investigation." Paper presented at the Interagency Language Roundtable Invitational Language Aptitude Testing Symposium, 1988. *Language Aptitude Reconsidered*. Ed. Thomas S. Parry & Charles W. Stansfield. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1990b.

_____ & Rebecca L. Oxford. "Ants and Grasshoppers, Badgers and Butterflies: Qualitative and Quantitative Investigation of Adult Language Learning Styles and Strategies." Paper presented at the Symposium on Research Perspectives in Adult Language Learning and Acquisition, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, 1988.

_____ & _____. "Effects of Sex Differences, Career Choice, and Psychological Type on Adult Language Learning Strategies." *Modern Language Journal* 73 (1989): 1-13.

_____ & _____. "Adult Language Learning Styles and Strategies in an Intensive Training Setting." *Modern Language Journal* 74 (1990): 311-27.

Horwitz, Elaine K. & Dolly J. Young. *Language Learning Anxiety*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1991.

Kogan, N. "Educational Implications of Cognitive Styles." *Psychology and Educational Practice*. Ed. G. S. Lesser. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman, 1971: 242-92.

Lavine, Roberta, Rebecca Oxford, & Madeline Ehrman. "Student-Student Style Clashes in the Language Classroom," forthcoming.

Lawrence, Gordon. "A Synthesis of Learning Style Research Involving the MBTI." *Journal of Psychological Type* 8 (1984): 2-15.

Leaver, Betty Lou. "Hemisphericity of the Brain and Foreign Language Teaching." *Folia Slavica* 8 (1986): 76-90.

McCarthy, Bernice. The 4MAT System. Oakbrook, IL: Excel, Inc., 1980.

Mosston, Muska & Sara Ashworth. *The Spectrum of Teaching Styles*. New York: Longman, 1990.

Myers, Isabelle B. & Mary H. McCaulley. *Manual: A Guide to the Development and Use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1985.

Naiman, Neil, Maria Frohlich & Angie Todesco. "The Good Second Language Learner." *TESOL Talk* 5 (1975): 58-75.

Nyikos, Martha & Rebecca Oxford. "A Large-Scale, Factor-Analytic Study of Language Learning Strategy Use in a University Setting: Interpretations from Information-Processing Theory and Social Psychology." Submitted for publication.

Omaggio, Alice C. *Teaching Language in Context: Proficiency-Oriented Instruction*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle, 1986.

Oxford, Rebecca. "Language Learning Strategies and Beyond: A Look at Strategies in the Context of Styles." *Shifting the Instructional Focus to the Learner*. Ed. Sally S. Magnan. Middlebury, VT: Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1990a: 35-55.

_____. *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*. New York: Newbury House/Harper & Row, 1990b.

_____. "Styles, Strategies, and Aptitude: Important Connections for Language Learners." Paper presented at the Interagency Language Roundtable Invitational Language Aptitude Testing Symposium, 1988. *Language Aptitude Reconsidered*. Ed. Thomas S. Parry & Charles W. Stansfield. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1990c, in press.

_____ & Madeline Ehrman. "Psychological Type and Adult Language Learning Strategies: A Pilot Study." *Journal of Psychological Type* 16 (1988): 22-32.

_____ & Martha Nyikos. "Variables Affecting Choice of Language Learning Strategies by University Students." *Modern Language Journal* 73 (1989): 291-300.

Parry, Thomas S. "The Relationship of Selected Dimensions of Learner Cognitive Style, Aptitude, and General Intelligence Factors to Selected Foreign Language Proficiency Tasks of Second-Year Students of Spanish at the Secondary Level." Diss., Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, 1984.

Politzer, Robert L. "An Exploratory Study of Self-Reported Language Learning Behaviors and Their Relation to Achievement." *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 6 (1983): 54-68.

Reid, Joy M. "The Learning Style Preferences of ESL Students." *TESOL Quarterly* 21 (1987): 87-111.

Saunders, D. *Type Differentiation Indicator: Manual, Research Edition—A Scoring System for Form J of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1987.

Schmeck, R. (Ed.). *Learning Strategies and Learning Styles*. New York: Plenum, 1988.

Semple, E. "Learning Style: A Review of the Literature." [ED 222 477, 1982.]

Shipman, Stephanie & Virginia Shipman. "Cognitive Styles: Some Conceptual, Methodological, and Applied Issues." *Review of Research in Education* (Vol. 12). Ed. Edmund W. Gordon. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association, 1985: 229-91.

Stevick, Earl W. *Success with Foreign Languages: Seven Who Achieved It and What Worked for Them*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1989.

Vitz, Paul C. "The Use of Stories in Moral Development: New Psychological Reasons for an Old Education Method." *American Psychologist* 45 (1990): 709-20.

Willing, Ken. *Learning Styles in Adult Migrant Education*. Adelaide, South Australia: National Curriculum Research Council, 1988.

Witkin, H.A. & J. W. Berry. "Psychological Differentiation in Cross-Cultural Perspective." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 6 (1975): 4-87.

Witkin, H.A. & D. R. Goodenough. "Field Dependence and Interpersonal Behavior." *Psychological Bulletin* 84 (1977): 661-89.

Wubbels, Theo, Mieke Brekelmans, Hans Creton & Herman Hooymayers. "Teacher Behavior Style and Learning Environment." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, 1988.

Young, Dolly J. "Understanding and Coping with Language Anxiety: A Summary of Theory and Practice." Submitted for publication.

Articulating Learning in High School and College Programs: Holistic Theory in the Foreign Language Curriculum

Janet Swaffar
University of Texas at Austin

Articulation as a Pressing Problem

One of the most telling problems in American foreign language (FL) instruction today is the placement of students into college courses.[1] Inadequate placement tests are symptoms rather than causes. Placement problems stem from the underlying dilemma: no consensus about a coherent instructional sequence from high school through college. The profession lacks a sequence based on a shared framework for foreign language learning and teaching.

Individual institutions fill the gap between high school and college foreign language classes in different ways. Often they provide special courses for false beginners or accelerated courses to aid in a more rapid transition. At best, these solutions are remedial and reflect a degree of complacency about college versus high school standards. They ignore factors such as language loss due to interrupted study, or differences in learning styles among adolescents and students in their late teens and early twenties. Perhaps most important, they ignore growing outside

pressures to reconsider current practices. Remediation fails to address the main issue lurking behind the placement dilemma: our high school and college courses do not complement one another. This lack of complementariness reflects current problems in defining language acquisition as a component of our larger mission: helping students acquire cultural literacy.

In order to meet the challenge of articulating from high school to college and throughout the college curriculum, we must be willing to challenge the status quo of our college programs, re-examining our goals and the concepts upon which our programs are based in their greater university/college context. This chapter looks first at general practices and policies in FL departments, and then suggests some innovations those departments might consider to address the question of articulation.

Traditional Views about Language Learning in Colleges and Universities

Articulation is a multifaceted issue that has, traditionally, been addressed as a purely linguistic issue. College-level programs must speak to the needs of a growing population of students with diverse backgrounds in foreign languages who are currently appearing on college campuses. They must offer those students tasks which enable them to capitalize on learning stressed in secondary schools: positive attitudes toward the FL, information about its culture, the vocabulary of everyday speech, and relative ease in expressing personal views. Yet, at the same time, college programs need to work with those students' problems with formal features. Faulty usage often characterizes performance of entering students, particularly those who studied FL some years ago and "have forgotten most of it."

Despite being aware of these linguistic articulation problems, the profession has been relatively unresponsive to how functional use of a FL and cognitive development operate as factors in learning (Bialystok & Smith, 1985). At the postsecondary level, differences between what students in high school and college can be expected to learn are rarely talked about. While the importance of functional use is acknowledged at the college level, it has made relatively few inroads into college placement and testing procedures. Foreign language teachers in high schools tend to apply a more flexible yardstick for language and language learning, one that rewards communicative success to a greater degree than is generally characteristic of their university counterparts. While high schools teach language in real-life situations, colleges still emphasize grammar knowledge.

If articulating secondary and postsecondary language learning is important, that continuity must emerge as shared goals and evaluation standards. Unfortunately, questions about whether the L2 language is the language of instruction, whether student performance should reflect productive or receptive knowledge, and what measures of competency should assess progress are rarely addressed by college departments or testing entities. As a rule, those decisions fall to the teachers of individual courses or directors of individual programs. Placement tests, whether developed nationally or institutionally, emphasize sentence-level linguistic knowledge to assess elementary learning. Rarely are the students tested on their ability to use appropriate strategies in a given context—revealing how they approach social and linguistic problem-solving as a linked undertaking. Equally rare are items which assess cultural knowledge as appropriate use of factual data in conjunction with linguistic data. To some extent this failure to reward "learning to learn" at the postsecondary level stems from historical shifts in the emphases and focuses in college instruction.

A century ago, departments focused on teaching language. Teachers taught several languages, chiefly for reading comprehension. There were few graduate students and fewer teaching assistants. Today, both the goals and the instructional practices are very different. Most FL professors concentrate their time and energy on graduate level research—papers in the theory of literature and linguistics. The undergraduate program—the upper-division as well as beginning language instruction—frequently plays a secondary role in decisions about promotion and salary. Benseler (1990) cites the growing concern that emphasis on graduate work has resulted in unfocused upper-division programs. In short, in many universities, the entire undergraduate curriculum in foreign languages lacks a coherent direction. Certainly that direction is quite unlike activities high school students enjoy in acquiring a language. Without even the pretense of transition, college placement and programs ask incoming high school students to change *both their mode of study and their role as language learners* (Byrnes, 1990).

How Second Language Research Helps Us Reassess Traditional Wisdom about FL Learning

A pedagogical approach based on second language research provides a new framework with which to access secondary students' cognitive and educational development. It allows us to rethink attitudes and assumptions based on data construed by our historical framework.

One historical preconception that has plagued work in language

instruction since World War II is dichotomous thinking about language methodologies. Foreign language departments have tended to think, for example, in terms of a program that was either audiolingual or grammar-based or communicatively-based or comprehension-based or four-skills etc., as though the various options were mutually exclusive. More recently, in the wake of counterproductive debates about which method to employ, some colleagues have turned to what has been styled an eclectic approach, substituting methodological pluralism for a single system. However, neither a particular method nor eclecticism address the problems outlined in this chapter: the profession's need to establish an organized way to think about how language is learned in an instructional setting.

Questions colleagues and students raise such as "how to teach grammar" and "what about vocabulary lists" reflect a general perception that grammar and vocabulary are distinct from the cognitive processes involved in reading or writing about a particular message. Yet if students are to learn both explicit grammar rules and awareness of correct form, there can be no debate about the fact that both types of "learning" occur. The only real question is whether rules are best applied if learned independently or as a function of expressing particular messages. The claim that students need linguistic rules is not the same thing as the claim that teaching linguistic rules fulfills this need. Yet studies have been interpreted this way, largely because the profession has lacked a perspective anchored in language acquisition theory and research.

As a case in point, Chastain and Woerdehoff's (1968) study about the efficacy of rule training, the cognitive code principle, can be viewed as evidence in behalf of teaching structural rules in isolation. The study can, from the standpoint of current research in second language acquisition, also be construed as revealing how rules affect interactive processes. In the Chastain and Woerdehoff study, both control and experimental groups engaged in audiolingual drill or rote learning of dialogues. Consequently, one major difference between the two was that the experimental group understood why they were saying what they were saying. Their language acquisition was more holistic than that of the experimental group because *it integrated comprehension of meaning with learning of vocabulary and grammar.* Along with information about the structures used in dialogues, the experimental group learned the meaning of individual words and their grammar function within a discourse. Consequently, their "cognitive code" encompassed more than purely structural rules about language.

One great value of Chastain and Woerdehoff's benchmark research

twenty years ago is that it helped move the profession away from behaviorism in language teaching toward approaches based on cognitive theories of second language acquisition. But as suggested above, the important insight in the study goes beyond conclusions about rules. It reveals that students need to *connect* language rules and meaning. Today language acquisition theory has contributed additional data about how subtle combinations of factors affect learning grammatical speech (McLaughlin, 1987, pp. 98-101). Unfortunately, instead of being cited as an impetus to investigate such questions, Chastain and Woerdehoff's data are often reduced instead to the claim that FL learners need more grammar rules.

In an era concerned about how to facilitate language acquisition, such assertions are uninformative. Linguistic rules represent only one measure of acquisition. Pragmatic and dependency grammars introduce other levels: social adequacy and meaningfulness. Grammars represent only one among many cognitive interactions involved in successful communication.

Another ghost to be laid to rest is the specter raised by the 1982 report of Higgs and Clifford. Their label "terminal two," revived fears that "fossilization," or "repetitive error patterns in language structure" (p. 67), results from a teacher's failure to attend to and correct all deficiencies in speech and written composition.[2] Higgs and Clifford's concerns appeared during the same period in which Krashen denied the validity of rule learning in the language acquisition process—a position he has subsequently modified. Their suggestions have frequently been misinterpreted as a dictate asking teachers to correct all faulty grammar all the time—as contrasted with *periodic correction of select features under pedagogically grounded conditions*. At this point in time, any claims about the sources of "fossilization" lack empirical confirmation.[3] Higgs and Clifford compared no "communicative" section's performance with a control group exposed to an alternative presentation that emphasized practice with language mechanics.

In the absence of an experimental study, Higgs and Clifford's thoughts are based largely on inferences about Carroll's 1967 work, research conducted to investigate quite different hypotheses.[4] No evidence establishes that a communication-first course will necessarily, or even customarily, lead to a terminal profile, any more than an accuracy-first orientation will guarantee that a terminal profile can be avoided. Indeed, Higgs (1985) has subsequently emphasized the importance of linking presentation of grammar with meaningful contexts and content.

More recently, in one branch of language acquisition research, studies in interlanguage suggest that errors occur as part of the learning

process (Faerch & Kasper,1983). Similarly, pedagogical or "action" research that compares an accuracy-first approach with a communicative emphasis suggests that initial classroom focus on form inhibits language learning and language production (Vigil,1987).

At present, our best indications are that students learn to be accurate through writing expanded discourse rather than through writing sentence-drill exercises (Dvorak, 1986). Essay-writing assignments apparently yield more learning about accuracy than when equivalent time is spent practicing rules for sentence-level accuracy (Robb et al., 1986).

In a very real sense, Carroll's (1967) research supports holistic learning that begins in secondary schools. The study reveals measurable gains for those FL majors who started training in high school over those who began in college when instruction in high school was conducted in the foreign language and when students used the FL in class (pp. 136-37). In balance, then, "fossilization" can hardly be assumed in a learning sequence that uses structural input as a component of the acquisition process. Indeed, the most realistic mode of dealing with fossilization is one that connects learner perception about messages to accurate and effective comprehension and expression of messages.

Many lower division sequences at the college level already include aspects of such holistic approaches. When compared with the additive approaches characteristic of previous decades, recent trends favor integrating skills and emphasizing cognitive capabilities.

The two lists in Table 1 reveal why a holistic framework is more appropriate than an additive one for the needs of the student populations now appearing in postsecondary institutions. Additive approaches tend to assume stages in mastery on the basis of a structural grammar model rather than an acquisition model. Hence students who do not understand subjunctive usage or who have forgotten past tense forms are placed once more in beginning language courses. Their comprehension vocabulary or familiarity with basic units of speech will fail to register as an adequate basis for further study in an additive sequence defined only in a linguistic dimension. And because the additive sequence places considerable emphasis on mastery of linguistic information in isolation, students not taught in or responsive to focus on form find themselves beginning a type of language study entirely different from the one to which they have been previously exposed. To review, high school instruction stressed self-expression in casual conversation, factual reports, and describing familiar people, places, and events. When confronted with new or more narrowly defined linguistic expectations or learning styles with which they are unfamiliar, students must, in effect, start the study of a FL over again (Heath, 1983).

Table 1
Lower-Division Curricular Shift: Materials/Techniques

Additive syllabi, textbooks	*Holistic syllabi, textbooks*
Culturally neutral dialogues, edited texts, separate skill practice	Personalized language, meaningful texts as basis for oral, written work as well as reading
Sentence drill (fill in blanks): grammar rules linked to rules in formal accuracy	Integrative use: grammar linked to meaning in a sentence as well as to meaning in paragraphs and discourse
Grammar rules taught in class (30% or more of class hour). Cued by translation or grammatical terminology	Grammar rules learned by students mainly as independent activity outside of class; most of class time devoted to contextual practice that is cued by situational variables
Vocabulary lists to be memorized for active use—largely cued by translation	Distinction between actively used and comprehended words—vocabulary learning focuses on words essential to messages of text, understood and cued in L2 context[5]

Those FL departments that are willing to consider student learning evident in language use must alter their instructional expectations to accommodate a new concept of skills. Instead of speaking *per se*, the desired skill development will proceed from the use of preprocessed speech to creative language. Instead of decoding discrete information in reading, students will work with chunking information in larger segments of speech. Instead of decontextualized practice in sentence production, students will engage in writing that has an intended message. In short, instead of an additive grammar-based syllabus, departments will have to develop contextual and text-based syllabi for their students. The objective of these syllabi will be to bridge the gap between the language of everyday speech (simple sentences, contextually limited vocabulary, present tense, subjects, objects, prepositional phrases, and

relatively few discourse markers) and extended discourse (multiple paragraphs, complex sentences, a spectrum of tenses and voices, and less frequently used linguistic and discourse markers).

Toward a Coherent Pedagogy

In revealing how cognitive development and a focus on content can complement FL learning, research in second language acquisition is opening up new options for language learners. These options accommodate new perspectives on learning which can help us find more coherent assumptions about language learning as a developmental process (Egan, 1979; Cantoni-Harvey, 1987). Historically, teachers have thought that focus on learning form in a strict grammatical sequence produced the best results. For a time, others believed that an emphasis on a presumed "natural" sequence for learning was sufficient. Recently the pendulum has swung in the direction of the communicative emphasis which spirals grammar through increasingly demanding contexts (eliciting statements about past vacations rather than current activities, or speculation rather than assertions of fact). We now appreciate that cognitive development plays an important role in the order and ease with which students of different ages acquire different language skills (Bialystok & Smith, 1985; McLaughlin, 1987). Adults seem to acquire vocabulary and complex ideas more rapidly than younger learners (Swain, 1985). On the other hand, adolescents or learners between twelve and eighteen seem less inhibited about expressing themselves in a FL. By the same token, they are also less likely to attend to or be interested in accuracy problems. In short, different age groups have different learning capabilities.

It follows, then, that instructional practice should stress those activities to which different age groups respond: communicating everyday speech with high school and junior high school students, and analyzing and self-correcting with college-age students. Many would argue that such emphases reflect our current situation—hence the need to remediate the accuracy problems of high school learners with a vigorous review of grammar, in effect, starting from scratch. But such failure to acknowledge high school achievement sabotages articulation. If colleges cannot recognize the value of prior learning, it follows that public disenchantment with language learning will inevitably result. High school students used to real-word transactions in the FL are also sabotaged. While these learners will need to improve their accuracy, their pre-established inclination to speak can help shortcut grammar review.

College instruction can, but frequently does not, capitalize on such prior abilities to help students make a smooth transition to more sophisticated reading and writing. To avoid waste of high school learning, universities must revise their sequences with placement and assessment in high school rather than college modes. Colleges must replace fixed expectations about language use defined as grammar with a holistic standard, incorporating the social dimension of students' activities in high school. Despite changes in textbook format and the influence of proficiency testing, the fixed standard still dominates many placement and curricular decisions at the postsecondary level.

The burden of a shift to holistic assessment and curricula will be on college teachers. They are the ones who must expand social approaches to language into more sophisticated contexts applicable to more challenging texts. A holistic standard stresses the content and context for speech and encourages learners to think about what they want to say or write. For example, in a traditional program a teacher might ask for the first person singular form of the verb *to go*. In a holistic program teachers might ask instead that students read a story about a trip to the store and retell the story as though they were a character in the narrative. The first person singular use of the verb would characterize successful performance in both instances. However, by introducing context, content, and student intent, the teacher eliminates grammar terminology and replaces it with key holistic features: 1) students have a usage model in the text, 2) they have a communicative setting for natural speech, 3) they are asked to link comprehension and production tasks, 4) they must generate their own concept of the text's messages, 5) they tend to use more than one sentence at a time, and 6) they are invited to simulate a genuine communicative setting—sharing information as well as language. Holistic language learning provides students with a context, content, and tasks which enable them to use all six features.

These features seem to correspond more closely to conditions used in research findings about successful second language acquisition than does the fixed standard. Most models for second language acquisition strive to indicate a relationship between input and output. While accurate input will not lead automatically to accurate output (Long,1985), many students who have difficulties learning in traditional classrooms, seem to experience greater success when they combine listening and reading with speaking and writing in naturalistic settings. Although such individuals may experience frustration or even failure in traditional language classes, when these same students use the FL *to learn*, their motivation for continued study and their performance proves adequate to conduct business, study, or converse in the FL (Schulz, 1990). The

question confronting many postsecondary institutions is whether they are willing to introduce a genuine "learning to learn" program into their curriculum. Such a step would involve greater content emphasis than has been the case heretofore—teaching subject matter first and language second (Widdowson, 1981).

This content emphasis would build in transitions along the following lines: presume students coming from high school have practiced dialogues and activities related to going to the store. The college course has a segment comparing consumer practices in the first and second culture. After reviewing the high school contexts, the college program introduces increasingly longer readings with short-essay writing as its language review. The course may move on to films, literature, a consumer report, or commercial section, expanding the language use in accuracy and complexity without discarding the high school students' conceptual and linguistic base.

Arguably, trends of this kind exist. Both high-school and college curricula depend on subject matter and context to facilitate communication. Many high school and college programs stress cultural, historical, and literary aspects of the peoples who speak the particular language learned. However, such emphases may still reward mastery of content, not language *per se*, as the primary measure of student performance or reward cultural information without integrating the language component. For neither the language component nor accurate usage is ignored in a sequence that uses a holistic standard: instead, correctness plays a different role in that sequence. If directly linked to meaning, questions about accuracy cannot be limited to formal features. For example, in a discussion of Renaissance painting, the statement "*The Last Supper* was paint by Leonardo di Vinci" should surely be judged as more accurate than the linguistically correct statement "*The Last Supper* was painted by Vincent van Gogh"—but they rest on similar linguistic competence.

College teachers and placement tests tend to forget that primary concern with correctness stamps out curiosity and discourages spontaneity when students attempt such sentences. Despite mounting evidence regarding the importance of prior knowledge and comprehension, few placement tests assess the high school learner's grasp of language in conjunction with previously learned subject matter. Insensitive assessment and instructional modes can actually force errors in both fact and form, thereby underrating our students' high school achievements. Eliciting partial performance can easily lead to misdiagnoses.

As already indicated, perceptions about a college's professional responsibility towards the language learner is often skewed because of the special circumstances in many postsecondary language depart-

ments. In larger departments, at least some in the FL faculty are uninformed about students' linguistic problems because they themselves are not ordinary language students. Overall, graduate students in FL study represent a small percentage of the students who commence study in languages. Most who go on to get Ph.D.s come to FL departments from diverse backgrounds, their competencies not necessarily attributable to formal language instruction (the few rhetoric and composition courses for advanced undergraduate programs). It is not uncommon to find that as many as half of those graduate students are native speakers of the language taught or the wives and husbands of native speakers. With such demographics at the graduate level, the "ordinary" language learner can easily become the exception to professorial experience. And it is thus all too easy in undergraduate programs to attribute linguistic problems to failed remediation on the part of beginning instruction or to an unsatisfactory high school preparation, when actually the articulation scenario is set up to undo that preparation at every point.

The Absence of a Theoretical Framework: Its Impact on the Instructional Policies of University FL Departments

Because of the break which insulates language learning from the scholarly pursuits of the profession, many FL departments show little interest in the critical problems facing the profession as a whole. Traditionally, they view language learning as something students "need to get over" before they start their serious studies (in literature, culture, linguistics, or history). Self-proclaimed FL teachers are, therefore, in an isolated situation within the university—they tend to be viewed by their colleagues as engaged in a nonacademic enterprise (Redfield, 1989). These views are confirmed by the literature in the profession.

Bernhardt and Hammadou's review of research in FL teacher education (1987) finds that in the past ten years, only 78 articles have appeared on the topic of foreign language teacher education. Of these, only eight report the results of foreign language teacher education research (p. 293). Moreover, as the authors stress, most articles lack a "theoretical framework for the statements they contain." In other words, the authors suggest that the way the profession addresses teacher education reveals its disinclination to formulate a coherent program for language teaching in the United States. Articles report on spot remediation, not theories integrating FL study into the university structure.

This lack of a theoretical framework in teacher training perpetuates

the status quo in several pernicious ways. It further weakens the links between college and secondary school instructional behaviors because, without a theoretical framework that incorporates second language acquisition research into a general approach to learning at the college level, FL departments have no coherent policies to offer training programs. Hence we consistently refuse to engage in substantive input into the pedagogy of what secondary school teachers learn in language departments.

With this neglect of interface between FL and general learning, the FL department faculty falls back on a normative evaluation of formal language and places students without taking their actual learning abilities or interests into account. The FL teacher is deemed unable to teach a high school or beginning college student anything but *language*. And students, in turn, receive no credit for non-linguistic learning or understanding that they acquire through their earnest but imperfect command of the FL.

The Impact of an Absent Framework on the Training of College Teachers

Graduate programs that train teaching assistants neglect the average student in the same way. Generally a single FL program director conducts training and supervision. In some institutions that supervision is augmented by a class in the pedagogy of language instruction, again conducted by the program director or faculty interested in formal linguistics. Training and supervision stems from a small group, generally marked as "language teachers" in contrast to "serious scholars." Rarely do senior faculty share or rotate those responsibilities.

Since graduate assistants frequently serve the bulk of undergraduate students enrolled in FL programs in larger institutions, a political anomaly results. Those who serve the largest audience tend to have the numerically least significant representation at the level of departmental decision making. Indeed, the program director often finds him or herself a lone voice speaking to a faculty largely insulated from the pedagogical realities facing a large number of its instructors. When problems occur in upper-division programs for majors, it is the program director's fault if students seem to display insufficient linguistic preparation. Seldom do these instructors ask themselves if their courses are capitalizing on lower-division knowledge or if they are misconstruing that knowledge.

As a consequence, program directors frequently deal with two formidable tasks: 1) supervising and training a large number of graduate student teaching assistants in addition to their own research and teach-

ing, and 2) representing the special needs of teaching assistants to the rest of its faculty. To compound these problems, fewer than half such program directors have actually been trained in language pedagogy (Teschner, 1987). Although most can offer a wealth of practical experience, few have the theoretical background on which to build courses in teacher training. So they often have to undertake professional development in two scholarly directions while other faculty tend to have only one. And the second one—the pedagogical work—often has a relatively low scholarly status.

Recent issues of the *ADFL Bulletin* reveal how our lack of professional focus impacts on our curricula. Devens (1986), who worked with the MLA's Commission on Foreign Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics, reports on the doctoral programs at five large private and public universities across the United States. Faculty hosts had filled out questionnaires regarding programs, policies, and training of teaching assistants. Interviewers met with faculty, graduate students, and administrators at each institution. Her conclusion: "Our visits showed us that there is little uniformity in the world of graduate education. The universities we sampled lie along a spectrum of philosophies ranging from narrowly specialized scholarly training of graduate students in which language mastery plays an ancillary role to a much broader training that focuses on language as a skill and produces teachers of foreign languages and cultures who are vitally concerned with the basic undergraduate language instruction program" (p. 14). The commission concluded that these two emphases were strikingly different and clearly reflected in the interests and aspirations of graduate students. Certainly their findings reflect a notable lack of interdepartmental coherency about what their mission ought to be, or a sense of what real understanding graduate students had about what they were actually trying to teach.

Small wonder, in view of this lack of common objectives among FL departments nationwide (Devens & Bennett, 1986), that the majority of articles which address curricular problems for graduate programs do so from the standpoint of a single feature of the departmental enterprise such as teaching literature in the original or in translation (Lindenberger, 1986) or the role of linguistics (Fleishman, 1986). In this respect, they mirror similar articles about undergraduate programs that make suggestions about language for special purposes (Feustle, 1986; Elling, 1986) or issues surrounding proficiency (Richardson, 1986). Rarely do such articles treat upper-division or graduate programs as an integral whole of the university or a larger educational community. They rarely mention that language learning at college is a point on a potentially much longer continuum. When that responsibility is confronted, attention

centers on graduate training and job-related issues—on the teachers, not the students or their learning (Babcock, 1986; Rava, 1987). While this perspective is important, rethinking teacher training is only one aspect of a broader charge.

The Arguments in Favor of a Coherent Solution

Given our unfocused researcher-oriented curricula at all levels and absent theoretical framework for assessment of relating language learning to learning in general, current trends are rather frightening. We are in danger of being overwhelmed by undeserved presumptions. Not since the early sixties have our governmental and private funding agencies been so eager to offer us support.[6] Within our institutions, colleagues in other fields have vigorously promoted reinstatement of a language requirement. Interdisciplinary programs, initially the product of outside funding (Jurasek, 1988), are now appearing on the basis of internal institutional demand (Dannerbeck, 1987).[7] Our promise is, implicitly, that students can use language to learn.

In the long run, it will be impossible for FL departments to escape making good on this promise. Draper (1989) documents how more and more states are in the process of mandating foreign language requirements for not only two but three and four years of study. Already increases in numbers and years of secondary school populations enrolled in a foreign language have increased dramatically—from between 10% and 20% in most states in 1979 to between 20% and 30% in 1989. In Florida and Georgia enrollment has more than tripled. Seventeen states have reinstated college and university entrance requirements for foreign languages. With these numbers of students comes a cost accountability factor. Taxpayers and parents expect their dollars to produce tangible results. Programs that work get continued support. Programs that fail do not. Yet a situation in which the majority of students with two or more years of high school training must recommence language study in the first or second semester will be viewed by the public as evidence that taxpayer support for foreign language education at all levels is wasted money. If money has been invested, the desired culturally literate student must emerge as a result.

That expectation can be met only if FL departments recognize the need for a coherent sequence of language study based on a pedagogical theory that provides an organized way to think about how language is learned in instructional settings—that is, to focus on a learning sequence defined by contexts, information, skill, and student strategies *at every level*. Without such a sequence and its implementation, departments will

continue to abdicate their responsibilities through absent or inappropriate placement measures and curricular programs whose pedagogy makes virtually no substantive effort to build on secondary-school work. Content courses and multidisciplinary programs may still provide an alternative outlet for a rapidly expanding college audience of students with FL training, but they cannot, without our assistance, guarantee that college placement and curricula will optimize the progress of incoming high school students with functional language ability. If we fail to do so, public outcry is inevitable. Even beyond the crass dollar and cents level of accountability is another less tangible but certainly significant argument in favor of accepting the challenge outlined for us in the governors' report "America in Transition" (1989): FL curricula have an obligation to meet the educational needs of the public domain. That is, after all, our *raison d'être.*

Ultimately, then, the case for FL departments' willingness to rethink their mission within the educational community is relevant to the entire faculty. The vested interests here are by no means solely those of isolated language program directors or their teaching assistants. The political scope of the language sequencing dilemma extends beyond issues of turf and presumptions about scholarly focus. If professors of literature and linguistics are to continue teaching those subjects to graduate and upper-division students of language, they will have to do so with a sensitivity to the learning and acquisition needs of new audiences from widely varying backgrounds and with consequently varying language abilities. Unless we can be more successful in capitalizing on what our students already know, we shall not have that audience to educate.

Before such a shift in attitudes can be realized, however, departmental placement and undergraduate programs must develop a quite different profile than has been the case heretofore—and account for both high school and graduate school as origins and goals of the learning that they ask students to undertake. Until postsecondary departments across the United States assess their role within a larger spectrum of language instruction and are willing to make commensurate adjustments in their *entire* curricula, modifications in language programs and graduate training can offer no more than Band-Aid solutions. Without long-range planning based on a consensus about the theoretical framework for that planning, any real hope for coherent sequencing of instruction is as chimeric as it is vital to our continued survival. We cannot *prescribe* high school curriculum; however, we can *describe* how learning styles in high school could mesh with learning styles in college.

The Basis for Rethinking a Coherent Language Sequence: Learning and Acquisition Evidence

Even if college language departments acknowledge the need to rethink a pedagogical sequence for language instruction, many may still object that such a project cannot be successful in practice. There is considerable evidence that such is not the case. Other countries have successful FL learning sequences. European models, with their long instructional continuum, have a performance standard. Closer to home, Canadian immersion programs show measurable gains in language acquisition (Genesee, 1985; Swain & Lapkin, 1989). Such programs commence with content and learning.

Perhaps one reason FL departments find it so difficult to rethink a learning sequence which commences with a content orientation lies outside the academy and in American society itself. We are a nation that has lost a tradition of multilingualism once evident in German-, French-, and Spanish-speaking schools of the nineteenth and early twentieth century. The isolationism of the twenties still casts its shadow in the guise of American ambivalence toward bilingual or multilingual education. Despite rhetoric about a global society in a global marketplace, the nation seems reluctant to substitute polylingualism and global diversity for the security of a monolingual melting pot.

This may be the underlying reason for the reluctance of FL departments to look seriously at evidence about learning and acquisition which argues so forcefully for a holistic teaching approach, accounting for nonlinguistic as well as linguistic learning. After all, a content-based instructional approach such as that used in Canada threatens to produce children who are "un-American" in their thinking as well as their linguistic capabilities. When they encourage high school teachers to embark on programs in which history and geography are taught in conjunction with the FL, postsecondary institutions become advocates of bilingual education.

Again, evidence in learning and acquisition theory supports precisely this approach both in the grade school and high school. This is the period in which students are most uninhibited about speaking, most desirous of expressing opinions, yet less able to think analytically and develop connected ideas or attend to linguistic accuracy.

Later, as adult language learners, these same students will be more concerned with correctness and less likely to engage in spontaneous speech. Their cognitive development will help them maximize work in reading and writing (Halford et al.,1988). College students who, at an earlier stage in their learning, relied heavily on context to understand

nuances of FL meaning, will now be poised to expand their repertoire of form/meaning relationships acquired in high school. Frequent opportunities in high school to express personal experience and opinions will have rendered some of their language processing automatic, thereby freeing space in working memory for processing information from more abstract and unfamiliar materials (McLaughlin et al., 1983). A curriculum that optimizes the language learned prior to college can capitalize on those capabilities.

Cognitive work in L1 traces this same spiral development from simple statements to recognizing and producing sophisticated discourse (Peters, 1983). Apparently early language practice in L1 focuses on recognizing longer speech acts and identifying the components of those speech acts as meaningful units. Such recognition practice constitutes the essential first phase of a learning sequence which must now be augmented at the college level in two critical ways: 1) students must read relatively complex texts for detail, and 2) students at the college level must undertake extensive writing to practice expressing language at a level of linguistic sophistication beyond everyday speech.

Student instruction within a holistic framework is not remediation—as college FL courses are so often considered. Instead, it accounts for pedagogical realities. Different subject matter and instruction yield different responses. Often students who performed well in their high school setting are inhibited by unfamiliar demands posed by tests or procedures in the college classroom. *A holistic curriculum builds on the content and contexts of earlier instruction.* It spirals instruction in minimal stages. For example, presume that high school students have practice in discussing concrete topics such as their "own background, family, interests, work, travel, and current events," the Intermediate Level on the ACTFL proficiency scale (Omaggio,1986, p. 15). At the college level these students would first review high school learning. They might, in this case, describe their own families, and subsequently read an L2 article about family structure in America. After a review of discourse markers for comparison *(but, on the contrary, nonetheless),* students can then use the text's language to write out or talk about differences between their families and those discussed in the article. The language for comparisons is necessarily more sophisticated than the language necessary for descriptions. To compare, students need complex sentence structure ("My family has six children, but the article says the average American family has only one or two children".)

Such practice demands increased linguistic sophistication (complex sentences) without asking students to deal with unfamiliar vocabulary and concepts. Both L1 and L2 reading studies confirm the value of

familiar schemata for comprehension of and learning from written texts (Schallert, 1982; Carrell, 1983). At the same time, this activity sequence also prepares students for more abstract, extended discourse. Students who can compare "practical, social, professional, and abstract topics, particular interests, and special fields of competence" are a full level beyond the Intermediate stage on the ACTFL scale. Success depends on close coordination of the topics and activities of high school and post-secondary institutions on a local basis. Both high school and college programs will vary with student populations, school board decisions about textbooks, and instructional policy.

The implications of a holistic approach for departmental planning might be summed up as follows in Table 2.

Table 2
Holistic Frameworks and Their Implications for Articulation at the College Level

Holistic framework for language pedagogy	*Implications for FL department programs*
applies theory and research findings of learning and acquisition theory within linguistic conceptual communicative frameworks (Byrnes, 1984, pp. 317-18)	syllabus design mirrors principles of language acquisition these principles are implemented in the curricula of language and literature courses for majors in a FL department as well as in content courses serving an interdisciplinary audience of non-majors
diagnoses as well as tests individual processes of language acquisition	a learner-responsive syllabus addresses the shifting needs of diverse student populations
tests student command of formal features as a function of successful comprehension and communication of learning	emphasis on comprehension of textual message systems and articulation of that understanding in written discourse

One way of expressing the fundamental difference between a holistic framework and departmental use of a particular methodology or an eclectic approach to curriculum planning, is that, as its designation suggests, the holistic frame is comprehensive. It addresses the problems of students at any point in their continuum of language study from beginning instruction through graduate study. It addresses problems in a way that acknowledges the value of previous work and identifies ways to build on it. To be sure, syllabi and tests probably apply a range of techniques from various methodologies, e.g., counseling-learning, four-skills, or the natural approach. While a holistic pedagogical framework may incorporate features of different methodologies, it should not be confused with methodological pluralism or eclecticism *per se*. Quite different from an "anything goes" approach, a holistic framework identifies appropriate pedagogical responses to learner sequences in language acquisition.

Without a theoretical framework, no consistent national direction is possible and FL departments resort to addressing manifestations of problems rather than their origins. Several serious concerns of the profession at lower-, upper-, and graduate-level teaching, that we have already identified above, can be addressed by adapting a framework based on what we know about language acquisition and learning processes. The sections that follow attempt to illustrate this assertion from various points of view.

Solution 1: How a Language Acquisition Framework Can Orient Undergraduate Instruction

The benefits of an acquisition orientation are by no means limited to placement. A holistic sequence would actually prepare students for the expanded purview of upper-division work in a department in a manner more conducive to continued language study than is currently the case. It would allow us to use facets of our postsecondary FL program we have failed to integrate heretofore. Upper-division curricula are already poised to adapt to the holistic expectations of a lower-division program such as that outlined earlier in this chapter. If lower- and upper-division programs at the university level worked with parallel subject-matter emphases, such redundancy would ease students' transition to advanced courses from earlier work. The same principles apply here as apply to the transition for secondary school students. When our objective is functional language use, we need to reinforce the content or information

that is the basis for usage. Familiar content fosters automatic processing, thus freeing students to engage in new learning, a cognitive demand that will necessitate their controlled processing (McLaughlin et al.,1983).

The following chart illustrates the emergent features of upper-division programs. Compared to characteristics of FL departments a decade ago, it suggests a far greater orientation toward functional language use in a range of social settings.

Table 3
Upper-Division Program Emphases

Traditional syllabi	*Expanded syllabi*
Canon of literature as genres, periods	Literature as part of cultural values: popular culture, multimedia options, intertextuality rather than formal genre thematic rather than period emphases
Language for sentence level accuracy required of: double majors minors	Pragmatic use of language in: culture tracks language in careers study abroad content courses

---

The expanded curriculum on the right reaffirms a practical move toward integration of content and language learning which lacks only a pedagogical framework to facilitate the transition from a supplementary to a mainstream focus on departmental goals. When departments can recognize the value of a content-based approach to learning content, they can then eliminate counterproductive dichotomies between courses for specific skills (Chamot & O'Malley, 1987; Crandall, 1987). Instead of having to remediate grammar in isolation, which in practice achieves minimal gains, FL departments can focus on applications of informational knowledge linked directly to linguistic knowledge. In German, for example, speakers use adverbial markers for emphasis. Word order changes as a result: *Heute kommt er* rather than *Er kommt heute.*

Assignments that focus on this connection between word order and speaker intent help students become sensitive to distinctions in form as

signals for distinctions in meaning. But identifying their use as rhetorical gambits in texts or spoken dialogues in media renders them more memorable still, as part of larger cultural learning. Initial subject-matter emphasis in no way excludes a smooth transition to reading literature at more advanced levels. On the contrary, by linking language to realizations of meaning, students receive a foundation in both text-linguistic and reader-response approaches to interpretation (Davis, 1989) and start learning to learn not only language or facts in isolation, but their strategic realization as cultural artifacts.

Solution 2: How a Coherent Pedagogy Could Inform the Graduate Program in FL

Holistic pedagogy can also inform the profession by reducing the gap between expectations about what constitutes a scholar and what constitutes a FL teacher. An explicit linking of these two concepts is particularly relevant for our graduate training. As already noted, coherence is perhaps the single most absent feature in most graduate programs. The diversity of fields in today's literary studies illustrates what happens when curricula change and departments fail to see the broader classroom implications of those changes: we add new topics courses without rethinking the pattern of total course offerings. In the past twenty years the once relatively narrow spectrum of positivism, intellectual history, and text-immanent criticism has expanded into over a dozen competing critical theories. In the absence of coherent pedagogy about how to learn and apply these theories, the sheer breadth of demands placed on graduate students is rapidly leading to confusion about standards for competence. Are students learning literature or a critical mode, linguistics or language? Without a pedagogy into which to fit this broadened scope of studies, theories of literature and linguistics (reader response, translation as reception, semiotics, poststructuralism, deconstruction, structuralism, text-linguistics, phenomenology, feminist criticism) are frequently perceived as unrelated to high school or undergraduate teaching.

Yet as the list suggests, more recent literary theories share presumptions about literature as an artifact that reflects its cultural setting, a document that arises out of a particular time and place. Current graduate programs in cultural geography, dialect studies, colonial literatures, women's studies, and minority studies all illustrate this point. Given applications of these theories, prior learning about a period's social, political, economic, geographic, and scientific background renders literature from such an era more comprehensible to readers—

theories about how cultural artifacts work automatically prescribe assumptions about what is learnable and worth learning.

The new options are considerably more extensive than the old ones, thereby implying a diffuse focus. Those options can, however, also be viewed as frames for textual interpretation. Iser's (1981) or Scholes' (1985) reader-response theories are directly applicable to classroom teaching, as are text-linguistics or semiotics. If such studies are linked to creation of reading and writing assignments that reflect these theories, this activity could serve a dual purpose. Graduate students could see direct connections between, for example, theory in text-linguistics and their own classroom teaching. They could use explicit applications to teach a particular poem in first semester Spanish. After choosing a poem that presents appropriate features, the teacher would, for instance, ask students to look for shifts in usage such as pronoun substitution or unusual word order that signals shifts in meaning—foregrounding particular topics in the poem (an interpretive activity) by identifying grammar features (a language learning activity). A graduate program that made various theoretical applications a consistent feature in its teaching at all levels would link research and teaching together as learning strategies. Potentially, it would enhance language skills of graduate and undergraduate students, since, presumably, all participants would use the L2 to think out and implement interpretive assignments.

Solution 3: How Language Pedagogy and Language Learning Become Central Components of Speciality Work

A holistic pedagogical framework, because it is content- and context- or culture-based, would be anchored in a broader definition of language competence than that reflected in command of structural rules. It would equip junior scholars to teach not only others, but themselves as well, since it would include competence in text-linguistics, discourse analysis, speech act theory, sociolinguistics, universal grammars, semantic grammars, and language pragmatics. As Fleischman (1986) points out, advanced undergraduate and graduate courses need to teach students how to apply linguistic methodology to reading and interpretation of FL literature. Without such such practice in turning theories into applications, graduate students are effectively cut out of advanced levels of professional dialogue in any of the graduate specialty fields.

The chart below sums up these expanded demands by exemplifying graduate studies in FL linguistics, comparing the largely structuralist

programs of twenty years ago with the interrelated linguistic theories that abound at present.

Table 4
The Graduate Program Shift in Linguistic Studies

Structuralist or philological programs (Separate realms)	*Multitheory programs* (Factors formerly isolated in structuralist programs, now integrated)
phonology/morphology/syntax (often contrastive)	speech acts discourse theory supersentential grammars (meta)cognitive grammars pragmatic grammars semantic grammars generative-transformational grammars psycholinguistics
stylistics (metrics, register)	text-linguistics
etymologies, frequencies	sociolinguistics

The righthand column illustrates the degree to which linguistic programs in most foreign language departments have begun to converge with literary analysis and acquisition theory. For example, pedagogical discussions of *universal grammar* are founded on generative-transformational premises (a teaching-linguistics link). Reader-response theory and work in speech acts are closely aligned (a linguistics-literature link). Similarly, semioticians explore many of the same text features as poststructuralists (a linguistics-cultural studies link). It is thus imperative that language departments develop programs to make these links explicit. Only then can postsecondary departments "come to grips with our academic and intellectual identity and the increasingly diversified agenda of responsibilities" (Gay-Crosier, 1987, p. 4).

Conclusion: Restructuring to Implement a Holistic Framework

Gay-Crosier also points out that colleagues are concerned about hiring new faculty in nontraditional fields because tenure committees may fail to acknowledge their work. Although academic standards in unfamiliar disciplines exist, established faculty are often unable to identify features of intellectual and scholarly rigor within those disciplines. His warning that "under no circumstances should a representative of a 'nontraditional' field be rejected because of other colleagues' ignorance of or prejudice against this field" (p. 5) pinpoints an underlying structural problem: in most institutions, faculty in traditional fields must hire and subsequently assess colleagues who write in journals, propound ideas, and attend conferences with which their evaluators are largely unfamiliar.

Here, then, is the restructuring dilemma: how can departments as currently constituted renew rather than repeat themselves and make innovative planning and staffing decisions essential in order to build faculties competent to deal with different missions at all levels of instruction? For we can make no mistake about it. The new challenges for language departments impact on every level and every aspect of our FL curriculum.

To frame this challenge another way: increasing numbers of new students from ever-more-diverse backgrounds translate into a revised mission for language departments. That mission implies a whole series of related needs: 1) that departments, as presently constituted, have or will hire faculty who can meet the challenge, 2) that a consensus exists within departments about how the challenge should be addressed, 3) that departments are willing to engage in retooling—the essential long-range planning and development that will result in coherence among courses and programs, from the level of beginning instruction in secondary and post-secondary schools, subsequent placement, and upper-instruction through graduate work, and 4) that the profession as a whole recognizes the need for a national agenda that augments individual institutional efforts through conferences, consulting, and disseminating materials. The enterprise is worthy of our best efforts. Our profession's future may well depend on its ability to expand the mission of language study: to integrate theory, content courses, and language as coherent stages in *all* students' language acquisition.

Notes

1. My thanks to the Secretary of the Navy Fellowship program for providing me with release time to work on this project and to colleagues Katherine Arens, Heidi Byrnes, Sally Magnan, and two anonymous reviewers for their valuable editorial comments and emendations.
2. In the authors' words, "Experience has shown again and again that such fossilized patterns are not remediable, even in intensive language training programs or additional in-country living experience. Hence the designation terminal 2/2+" (p. 67).
3. Higgs and Clifford base their hypotheses about the "terminal profile" on Carroll's study of the proficiency levels of language majors in American colleges and universities (1967) and University of Minnesota findings about students who had predominantly unstructured language learning. On this basis, the authors imply that communicatively based programs fail to teach formal accuracy. To my knowledge, no research exists that compares performance between structured learning with a communicative textbook, unstructured learning, and group- taught formal features *independent* of communicative intent. In this sense, popular extrapolations about fossilization have distorted the problem by emphasizing one accuracy problem as though it were distinct from such accuracy problems as successful conveyance of meaning or situational appropriateness.
4. Indirect evidence suggests that training may have been more rule-oriented than it was communicatively-based. The language majors in Carroll's study who failed to do better than intermediate level on speaking exams report relatively restricted contact with their FL. Responses on a section about classroom language use allows inference that between 60% and 70% of the various language courses taken by both high school and college trained majors in foreign languages were coded in category one, i.e., "English was spoken as a general rule" (p. 136). The Carroll study which the authors cite uses student estimates of the foreign language spoken in high school and first- and second-year courses at college. The study offers only generalized data about whether the FL was used in advanced work.The questionnaire section on "Students' classroom language" (Appendix B, p. 2), has only two categories:

   1) Speaking in English was the general rule, except for some short periods of conversation in the foreign language;

   2) During class periods, the students were required to speak in the foreign language; only occasionally would English be allowed (p. 136).

5. This chart and variations of subsequent charts were first published in another context in the *Modern Language Journal* (Swaffar, 1989).
6. FIPSE funding is increasing in response to excellent proposals for multidisciplinary work. Personal communication with Helene Scher, January 26, 1990.
7. For descriptions of pilot projects, see "Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education Resources: The Comprehensive Project Descriptions 1988-1989." A wide variety of program types can be found in Hill's (1987) collection on study abroad. In addition, see Goodwin and Nacht (1988).

Works Cited

"America in Transition." Report of the Governors' Task Force on International Education. February 1989.

Babcock, Charles L. "Have Ph.D. Will Travel. To Teach What?" *ADFL Bulletin* 17 (1986): 5-8.

Benseler, David. "The Upper-Division Curriculum in Foreign Languages and Literatures: Obstacles to the Realization of Promise." *Critical Issues in Foreign Language Education*. Ed. Ellen Silber. New York: Garland Publishing, forthcoming.

Bernhardt, Elizabeth & Joann Hammadou. "Research in FL Teacher Education." *Modern Language Journal* 71 (1987): 289-99.

Bialystok, Ellen & Michael Sharwood Smith. "Interlanguage Is Not a State of Mind: An Evaluation of the Construct of Second Language Acquisition." *Applied Linguistics* 6 (1985): 101-17.

Byrnes, Heidi. "The Role of Listening Comprehension. A Theoretical Base." *Foreign Language Annals* 17 (1984): 317-29.

_____. "Addressing Curriculum Articulation in the Nineties: A Proposal." *Foreign Language Annals* 22 (1990): 281-92.

Cantoni-Harvey, Gina. *Content-Area Language Instruction: Approaches and Strategies*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1987.

Carrell, Patricia. "Three Components of Background Knowledge in Reading Comprehension." *Language Learning* 33 (1983): 183-207.

Carroll, John. *The Foreign Language Attainments of Language Majors in the Senior Year: A Survey Conducted in U. S. Colleges and Universities*. Cambridge, MA: Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, 1967. [ED 013 343.]

Chamot, Anna Uhl & J. Michael O'Malley. "The Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach: A Bridge to the Mainstream." *TESOL Quarterly* 21 (1987): 227-49.

Chastain, Kenneth & Frank J. Woerdehoff. "A Methodological Study Comparing the Audio-Lingual Habit Theory and the Cognitive Code Learning Theory." *Modern Language Journal* 52 (1968): 268-79.

Crandall, JoAnn (Ed.). *ESL through Content-Area Instruction: Mathematics. Science. Social Studies. Language in Education: Theory and Practice no. 69*, 1987. [ED 283 387.]

Connor, Ulla. "Research Frontiers in Writing Analysis." *TESOL Quarterly* 21 (1987): 677-96.

Dannerbeck, Francis J. "Adult Second-Language Learning: Toward an American Adaptation with a European Perspective." *Foreign Language Annals* 20 (1987): 413-19

Davis, James N. "The Act of Reading in the Foreign Language: Pedagogical Implications of Iser's Reader-Response Theory." *Modern Language Journal* 73 (1989): 420-28.

Devens, Monica S. "Graduate Education in Foreign Languages and Literatures: A View from Five Universities." *ADFL Bulletin* 17, iii (1986): 14-18.

_____ & Nancy J. Bennett. "The MLA Surveys of Foreign Language Graduate Programs, 1984-85." *ADFL Bulletin* 17, iii (1986): 19-27.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Draper, Jamie B. *The State of the States: State Initiatives in Foreign Languages and International Studies. 1979-1989*. Washington, DC: Joint National Committee for Languages, December 1989.

Dvorak, Trisha. "Writing in a Foreign Language." *Listening, Reading, and Writing: Analysis and Application*. Ed. Barbara H. Wing. Middlebury, VT: Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1986:145-67.

Egan, Kieran. *Educational Development*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979.

Elling, Barbara. "The German Business Diploma: A Model for Testing and Evaluation." *ADFL Bulletin* 18, i (1986): 46-49.

Faerch, Claus & Gabriele Kasper (Ed.). *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*. New York: Longman, 1983.

Feustle, Joseph A. Jr. "Spanish and Legal Assisting: A Collaborative Venture." *ADFL Bulletin* 17, ii (1986): 50-52.

Fleischman, Suzanne. "Getting Calliope through Graduate School? Can Chomsky Help? Or, the Role of Linguistics in Graduate Education in Foreign Languages." *ADFL Bulletin* 17, iii (1986): 9-13.

Gass, Susan M. & Larry Selinker (Ed.). *Language Transfer in Language Learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1983.

Gay-Crosier, Raymond. "Reshaping Foreign Language Programs: Implications for Department Chairs." *ADFL Bulletin* 19, i (1987): 3-7.

Genesee, Fred. "Second Language Learning through Immersion: A Review of U.S. Programs." *Review of Educational Research* 55 (1985): 541-61.

Goodwin, Craufurd & Michael Nacht. *Abroad and Beyond*. New Rochelle, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Halford, Graeme, Murray Maybery & John U. Bain. "Set-Size Effects in Primary Memory: An Age-Related Capacity Limitation?" *Memory and Cognition* 18 (1988): 480-87.

Heath, Shirley Brice. *Ways with Words: Language Life and Work in Communities and Classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Higgs, Theodore V. "Teaching Grammar for Proficiency." *Foreign Language Annals* 18 (1985): 289-96.

_____ & Ray Clifford. "The Push toward Communication." *Curriculum, Competence, and the Foreign Language Teacher*. ACTFL Foreign Language Education Series, vol. 13. Ed. Theodore V. Higgs. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company, 1982: 57-79.

Hill, Deborah J. (Ed.). *Innovative Approaches to Curriculum Design in the Study Abroad Program*. Columbus, OH: Renaissance Publications, 1987.

Iser, Wolfgang. *The Act of Reading*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1981.

Jurasek Richard. "Integrating Foreign Languages into the College Curriculum." *Modern Language Journal* 72 (1988): 52-58.

LaPidus, Jules B. "Humanizing Graduate Study in the Humanities." *ADFL Bulletin* 17, iii (1986): 5-18.

Lightbown, Patsy M. "Input, Interaction, and Acquisition in the SL Classroom." *Classroom Oriented Research in Second Language Acquisition*. Ed. Herbert W. Seliger & Michael Long. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1983: 217-43.

Lindenberger, Herbert. "Teaching Literature in the Original or in Translation: An Intellectual or a Political Problem?" *ADFL Bulletin* 17, ii (1986): 35-39.

Long, Michael. "Input and Second Language Acquisition Theory." *Input in Second Language Acquisition*. Ed. Susan M. Gass & Carolyn G. Madden. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1985: 377-93.

McLaughlin, Barry. *Theories of Second-Language Learning*. London: Edward Arnold, 1987.

_____, Tammi Rossmann & Beverly McLeod. "Second Language Learning: An Information-Processing Perspective." *Language Learning* 33 (1983): 135-58.

Omaggio, Alice C. *Teaching Language in Context*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle, 1986.

Peters, Ann M. *The Units of Language Acquisition*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Rava, Susan. "Training Teaching Assistants." *ADFL Bulletin* 19, i (1987): 26-27.

Redfield, James. "The Politics of Language Instruction." *ADFL Bulletin* 20, iii (1989): 5-12.

Richardson, Peter N. "Proficiency-Based Curricula: The View from the Hill." *ADFL Bulletin* 18, i (1986): 38-42.

Robb, Thomas, Steven Ross & Ian Shortreed. "Salience of Feedback on Error and Its Effect on EFL Writing Quality." *TESOL Quarterly* 20 (1986): 83-95.

Schallert, Diane L. "The Significance of Knowledge: A Synthesis of Research Related to Schema Theory." *Reading Expository Material*. New York: Academic Press, 1982: 13-48.

Scholes, Robert. *Textual Power: Literary Theory and the Teaching of English*. New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1985.

Schulz, Renate. "Second Language Acquisition Theories and Teaching Practice: How Do They Fit?" *Modern Language Journal* 74 (1990), in press.

Shaffer, Constance. "A Comparison of Inductive and Deductive Approaches to Teaching Foreign Languages." *Modern Language Journal* 73 (1989): 395-403.

Swaffar, Janet. "Competing Paradigms in Adult Language Acquisition." *Modern Language Journal* 73 (1989): 301-14.

Swain, Merrill. "Communicative Competence: Some Roles of Comprehensible Input and Comprehensible Output in Its Development." *Input in Second Language Acquisition*. Ed. Susan M. Gass & Carolyn G. Madden. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1985: 235-53.

_____ & Sharon Lapkin. "Canadian Immersion and Adult Second Language Teaching: What's the Connection?" *Modern Language Journal* 73 (1989): 150-58.

Teschner, Richard V. "A Profile of the Specialization and Expertise of Lower Division Foreign Language Program Directors in American Universities." *Modern Language Journal* 71 (1987): 28-35.

Vigil, Virginia Dorothea. "Authentic Texts in the College Level Spanish I Class as the Primary Vehicle of Instruction." Diss., University of Texas at Austin, 1987.

Vines, Lois. "Foreign Language Courses for Journalism and Communication Majors." *ADFL Bulletin* 20, ii (1989): 64-69.

Widdowson, H. G. "English for Special Purposes: Criteria for Course Design." *English for Academic and Technical Purposes*. Ed. Larry Selinker, Elaine Tarone & Victor Hanzeli. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1981: 1-11.

Reconsidering the FL Requirement: From Seat-Time to Proficiency in the Minnesota Experience

Betsy K. Barnes, Carol A. Klee, Ray M. Wakefield
University of Minnesota

Introduction

The past decade has seen a renewed interest in foreign language study, manifested both in increased enrollments in secondary foreign language programs and in new or strengthened FL requirements at the postsecondary level. Between 1982 and 1985, the number of high school students enrolled in FL classes increased by 38% (Cheney, 1989, p. 30). According to MLA surveys of B.A.–granting institutions, the percentage of these institutions having a FL requirement for entrance jumped from 14% in 1982-83 to 26% in 1987-88, while those with a degree requirement rose from 47% to 58% during the same period (Brod & Lapointe, 1989, p. 17).

These increases, noted in the late 1980s, constitute the first rise in interest in foreign language study since the decline of the late sixties, presumably due to a perceived lack of relevance of the foreign languages. The current renaissance of foreign language study can be attributed to a new awareness penetrating society as a whole of the importance of international and multicultural studies, due to the increasingly interdependent nature of political and economic systems worldwide. This

new international consciousness has resulted in the promotion of new educational goals, including both practical language competence and knowledge of specific cultures, as well as the less tangible "understanding" of cultural differences. Discussion of these goals and their underlying rationales has led to debate over the relative importance of training in practical skills vs. instruction leading to appreciation of cultural differences (Nichols, 1988; Perkins, 1988; Patrikis, 1988). However, there appears to be a general consensus, at least within the profession if not more widely as well, that language study is a central vehicle for the acquisition of cultural understanding.

Coinciding with this new-found general enthusiasm for other languages and cultures, the FL profession has witnessed a new emphasis on instruction leading to the achievement of practical, functional competence in the language being taught. This development represents not so much a change in goals as a realization and acknowledgement that previously stated goals such as communicative competence were often not being realized. It is this realization that has led, in a few cases, to a significant innovation in the nature of the postsecondary FL degree requirement, namely to a reformulation of the requirement in terms of minimal levels of proficiency to be attained, rather than in terms of a number or level of courses to be completed. Such a formulation explicitly recognizes that *seat-time* does not necessarily entail competence. The reasoning is: if in fact linguistic competence is the actual goal, why not state the requirement in precisely these terms?

The notion of a proficiency-based requirement raises a number of issues, both practical and theoretical. Such a formulation clearly makes both the students and those planning and delivering instruction decisively more accountable for the results of their efforts. Some will ask whether such an approach is not excessively product-oriented, focusing on skills training at the expense of the less tangible goals referred to above. While it is true that a proficiency-based requirement may appear to slight the goal of cultural understanding, this need not and should not be true. Few teachers would claim that a set of proficiency-oriented objectives, based solely on listening, speaking, reading, and writing, determines the total content of the curriculum. Cultural learning can and does remain an important element of the curriculum, particularly if linguistic and cultural learning are thoroughly integrated, as the profession has stated that they ought to be. The major reason that cultural learning has not been assessed is our inability to objectively describe and evaluate this kind of learning to the same extent as the linguistic skills.

Some critics of the proficiency-oriented approach have suggested that a proficiency-based formulation may actually weaken the FL re-

quirement by showing that, even in programs with relatively strong requirements (i.e. two years at the university level), only limited practical skills can be achieved in the time available. Several responses are possible. First, we should acknowledge the time necessary for learning foreign languages, especially in the classroom, and work toward educating the public about the realities of the language learning experience. Second, a FL requirement is best viewed not as an end in itself, but rather as preparation for actual use of the foreign language in subsequent undergraduate coursework or in the culture; and this goal applies to *all* students, not just to language majors.

Rather than weakening the requirement, we believe that a proficiency-based requirement has the potential to significantly strengthen the FL requirement. From the students' perspective, a proficiency-based requirement makes more sense since it does not impose coursework for its own sake, but rather as a means toward the desired proficiency. Given Morello's (1988) finding that progress in the oral/aural skills is the most important element in a favorable student attitude toward language study, a proficiency-based requirement would appear to be consonant with students' primary interests. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, a proficiency-based requirement avoids the trap of the seat-time requirement that leads Nostrand (1988, p. 33) to describe the latter as "a mixed blessing in the long run" given that "it eventually self-destructs because it protects complacency".

Under the Former Seat-time Requirement

In the years before the advent of the proficiency-based requirement, we had to deal with the whole range of problems traditionally associated with seat-time requirements. Foremost among these problems was that of student apathy. Since students did not perceive any connection between the seat-time requirement and the general education requirements for the B.A. degree, they often conceived of their task as one of survival: the least amount of effort to rid themselves of an obstacle between them and the degree. As directors of language instruction (DLIs), we had to face a problem common to virtually all seat-time requirements: students, irrespective of the amount of prior language instruction, would place themselves in the very first quarter of the sequence in order to improve their GPAs. This practice not only demoralized true beginners in the same classes, it left most teachers with a sizeable student segment that was bored to tears. And yet, the seat-time concept left us few weapons to get at the root of student apathy, namely a perception of a FL requirement disconnected from the rest of their educational experience. As Patrikis (1988) recently asked:

> What, after all, would impel a student to master a foreign language? Not a foreign language requirement, the pieties and platitudes of which even a naive freshman can see through. If a requirement specifies three or four semesters in the classroom with a mediocre final grade, we can scarcely claim that incentives are built into the curriculum... What would impel a student to study a foreign language if he or she had little or no opportunity to make use of that language in the other courses and other activities of the undergraduate years (p. 17)?

We also faced another problem which is fairly common in seat-time requirements. When departmental administrators seek to impress collegiate administrators with the need for an increase in instructional support, they often embark on a cycle of increasing student numbers per section in the first and second years of instruction, i.e. in that part of the departmental program taught almost exclusively by TAs. During the seat-time requirement, section limits of 25 were raised to 30 and then to 35 over a period of several years. Even at 35, TAs were encouraged to take on additional students so that the chairpersons would have sufficient ammunition to present to the deans. This effort at gaining a competitive edge over other language departments placed an inordinate burden on TAs and also on the DLIs who functioned as the sole link between disgruntled TAs and the departmental faculty.

It is not surprising that the seat-time requirement produced strong feelings of job alienation among the TAs, who felt caught between apathetic students and graduate faculty, indifferent to the beginning language program. As they observed the faculty who were their advisers for M.A. and Ph.D. programs, most often in literature, they often decided to adopt a similiar attitude of indifference toward the beginning language program. Given the inflated numbers of students they were being asked to teach, indifference and alienation may have been the most appropriate survival mechanisms. The seat-time requirement seemed to produce a sense of entrapment at all levels: students felt trapped by a senseless requirement; TAs felt trapped by an indifferent faculty; faculty felt trapped by a retrenchment-minded collegiate administration; and collegiate administrators felt trapped by demands for financial accountability from the university's central administration. Most trapped of all, of course, were the DLIs, because every constituency mentioned above held them ultimately responsible for resolving the unworkable situation.

The position of the DLI in these seat-time programs became one of isolation, as this individual was held responsible for all the problems in the language program but was empowered to solve none of them. In

addition to the burdensome workload, DLIs also faced a lack of respect from colleagues when it came time to evaluate their research. Dvorak (1986) deals with this point as a major factor in the frequent "burnout" problem among DLIs:

> the motivation required to continue to invest large amounts of energy and time is gradually eroded by the awareness that one's efforts are not highly valued in the dean's office, and are also considered by a number of one's colleagues to be inferior to the work of those in literature or "pure" linguistics in that they are perceived to involve little true expertise and scholarship (p. 220).

All these factors involve DLIs in what Dvorak terms "ghettoization":

> For LPCs [language program coordinators], the language program becomes a ghetto, a small preserve within which they spend almost all their time, but which their colleagues enter only on occasion, and then generally with condescension rather than admiration or enthusiasm. It is perhaps not necessary to mention what happens to one's self-esteem in finding that increasingly one works for a department, but not in it (p. 221).

The seat-time requirement also gave rise to unrealistic expectations among our students, many of whom were remarkably similiar to students surveyed by Horwitz (1988) at the University of Texas:

> Upwards of 40% of them felt it possible to become fluent in a second language in two years or less, and over 60% of the Spanish and German students felt that learning a foreign language was mostly a matter of translating from English (pp. 291-92).

Since our seat-time requirement allowed for one or two years of language study, it specifically confirmed the totally unrealistic beliefs already held by many of our students about the amount of study it takes to become "fluent" in a second language. Most left our programs as soon as permitted by the seat-time requirement, and they departed with a sense of betrayal. As Byrnes (1988) urged recently: "it seems appropriate to own up to what foreign language programs can achieve and not to blissfully promise the unattainable" (pp. 35-36). In our experience as DLIs, we found that students believed the College of Liberal Arts, by tying the FL requirement to seat-time, was guaranteeing "fluency" after one or two years of study, a highly unrealistic goal.

The Minnesota Second Language Proficiency Requirement

In 1983, the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, Fred Lukermann, appointed a task force to study the effectiveness of second language instruction in the College, with particular reference to the outcomes of the second language requirement. The finding of the task force was that students completing the requirement had not acquired, for the most part, a level of proficiency that would permit any real-world use of the language. The task force consequently recommended a change in the second language requirement, which was subsequently ratified by the appropriate bodies and took effect in Fall 1986.

The former second language requirement allowed students to take either five quarters of a language, or three quarters of a language plus three culture courses in English. Approximately 67% of the students chose the latter option. The new language requirement is innovative in a variety of ways:

1) It is a *proficiency-based* requirement, not a "seat-time" requirement.

2) It mandates attainment of a proficiency level normally attained after *two years of college-level study.*

3) Through an *entrance standard,* it recommends attainment of proficiency normally attained after *one year* of college study (or approximately three years of high school study) in French, German, and Spanish, i.e. the languages available in most high schools. Students who do not attain the required level of proficiency for entrance may study first-year French, German, or Spanish at the university, but will *not* receive graduation credit for first-year courses.

4) It rewards the study of less commonly taught languages, such as Russian, Japanese, Portuguese, and Dakota, by allowing students to receive credit for first-year courses in those languages.

In order to set proficiency standards for the entrance and graduation levels, language departments needed some common framework for describing various levels of proficiency. In spite of their shortcomings, we decided to use the framework provided by the *ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines,* since these furnish a comprehensive set of descriptions of proficiency levels which are fairly accessible to the nonspecialist. A working group of language educators from various secondary and postsecondary institutions in Minnesota agreed upon the following minimal levels for French, German, and Spanish:

Entrance (equivalent to approximately 1 year of university study)
Reading and Listening: *Intermediate Low*
Writing and Speaking: *Novice High*
Graduation (after approximately 2 years of university study)
Reading and Listening: *Intermediate High*
Writing and Speaking: *Intermediate Mid*

The same working group began developing the series of tests required to evaluate students' proficiency, with the major test development accomplished by directors of the language programs working with graduate research assistants provided by the College, all working under the direction of Dale Lange. We are still refining the tests and developing alternate versions. Proficiency is evaluated through a separate test for each skill (reading, listening, speaking, writing) and for each level (entrance and graduation), for a total of eight different tests. The Graduation Speaking Test consists of a modified Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI): since it is only necessary to verify attainment of the Intermediate Mid level, the interview is reduced to about 10 minutes in length. The form of the other tests is analogous to the structure of the OPI. That is, the distribution and ordering of items is according to the particular level of the function targeted by that item. Items are arranged so as to simulate the Warm-up, Level Check, Probes, and Wind-down phases of the OPI. The tests are administered at the beginning of Fall Quarter and at the end of Fall, Winter, and Spring Quarters. Test administration and scoring, as well as continuing test development, are carried out by a director of testing and three graduate assistants, one in each language. Scoring of writing tests and administration and rating of the speaking evaluations are done by TAs employed by each department.

The Transition from Seat-Time to Proficiency

A university does not move easily or swiftly from a seat-time to a proficiency requirement, and there was considerable confusion among students in the transitional years. First and foremost, beginning language classes were populated by two kinds of students, one on the old seat-time requirement and one on the new proficiency requirement. The same course could serve both groups, but the student attitudes created obvious tension in most classes. Students working on the seat-time requirement complained incessantly that the course was becoming too intensive; the proficiency group worried equally incessantly that the course might not be intensive enough to prepare them for the Graduation Proficiency Test. Fortunately, the seat-time group usually yielded first; in a few happy cases, these students were even motivated to take more FL courses than were minimally required in their degree programs.

The administration of the College of Liberal Arts also discovered during the transitional period that they had taken on a much larger project than anticipated. We are convinced that our experience in this respect is not unique, and we offer, as examples, these financial implications which were largely overlooked by our administrators.

1) Since student performance on the Graduation Proficiency Test was the sole means for satisfying the new requirement, language use in the classroom became a critical factor, and thus the average section size needed to be reduced dramatically and quickly. New staff needed to be hired to teach the greatly increased number of FL sections.

2) Proficiency tests needed to be developed, tests which required that staff be trained in ACTFL OPI procedures. Additional staff were also required to administer and edit the new tests. Specialists were needed to set and administer a new testing research agenda. Administrative budgets needed massive increases for record keeping, for communication with students and parents, and for copying and supplies. Finally, the need for more extensive and careful advising of students significantly increased the workloads of College advisory staff.

3) Less commonly taught languages, 25 of them in Minnesota's case, were also required to develop Graduation Proficiency Tests by Spring 1990, and thus these languages also required budget increases for training existing staff, for hiring new staff, and for supplies.

The fact that we are still negotiating for a number of the budgetary items above should be a clear signal to DLIs elsewhere that they must settle these financial issues *before* deans hand them a proficiency requirement without the necessary funding to implement it.

The new proficiency requirement also imposed confusion on TAs and DLIs during the transitional phase. New training responsibilities were required of the DLIs and new duties were required of the TAs.

1) DLIs needed to receive intensive ACTFL OPI training and to provide all TAs with familiarization training in the *ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines*.

2) DLIs needed to train selected TAs in the administration and evaluation of the writing and speaking tests for entrance and graduation. With the continual turnover of TAs, this training is necessarily ongoing.

3) DLIs needed to review the first six quarters of instruction and introduce changes which would bring about a stronger proficiency orientation.

While these adjustments were viewed as essential for the success of the new requirement, administrators also needed to understand that TAs could not be expected to assume additional duties without compen-

sation. A more serious and unexpected problem was encountered among TAs who had already been teaching in the seat-time program for several years. Many had been assigned to the same courses several times, had worked to develop these courses, and had acquired a sense of ownership. They viewed changes of any kind as a threat and an implied repudiation of their curricular contributions. A few were openly hostile; one or two attempted to organize the other TAs in opposition to the proficiency requirement.

Our colleagues also seemed confused by the transitional years of the proficiency requirement and now had to help us deal with language program issues on a weekly basis. As we introduced them to the finer points of the new program and provided research on testing and implementation, they grew increasingly familiar with the issues a DLI must confront daily. Though we hoped this increased awareness would draw our colleagues into greater involvement with the teaching and administration of the language program, we have not seen the realization of Byrnes'(1988) utopian dream "of an ideal situation, in which all full-time faculty members of the department are involved in language teaching as well as in their own specializations" (p. 38). Instead, our colleagues who were not already involved in the language program kept their distance. Whereas they had earlier insisted they were overqualified and too "expensive" for language courses that any graduate student could teach, they now insisted that the changes introduced a new field of research and teaching, one for which they had not been trained and for which they did not have the time to be trained.

Under the Current Proficiency Requirement

Although the transition from a seat-time to a proficiency requirement was difficult at times, with the implementation of a proficiency-based language requirement, we have noticed a number of improvements in the language programs. These are reflected in the change of students' attitudes and motivation, in the degree of administrative support for and TA involvement in the language programs, and in the increased level of respect for the position of director of language instruction.

First, there has been a major change in students' attitudes and motivation in the classroom. Students have begun arriving at the University more prepared in terms of language study than before. Students in the College of Liberal Arts are aware that they will not receive graduation credit for courses in the first-year sequences of French, German, or Spanish. Many are beginning language study in high school and attempt to place as high as possible to avoid paying tuition for

courses that will not count towards graduation. Thus, we are reducing the number of "false beginners," one of our previous problems and one of the placement problems most frequently mentioned by directors of Spanish language instruction nationally (Klee & Rogers, 1989; Loughrin-Sacco, this volume). Since students are penalized for not meeting the entrance standard in French, German, and Spanish, most attempt to pass the exams and enter directly into the second-year sequence. It appears that some students who have not begun language study in high school are turning to the less commonly taught languages, because they will receive graduation credit for first-year courses in those languages. Enrollments in the less commonly taught languages have increased considerably over the past two years.

In addition, even students who are taking language courses simply to meet the graduation requirement seem to be putting more effort and energy into their classes since they know they will have to pass the Graduation Proficiency Test to complete the language requirement. It is no longer adequate to slide by with a low C and a minimum of effort; students are very conscious of the fact that passing the courses is no longer sufficient to complete their degree requirements. Students who do not pass the Graduation Proficiency Test after six quarters of instruction are advised to audit the sixth-quarter course or work individually with a tutor and retake the section(s) of the exam they failed at the end of the following quarter of instruction. We hope eventually to provide special tutoring sections for students who have been unable to pass one or more sections of the proficiency exam.

An unexpected consequence of the proficiency-based language requirement has been a sudden increase in the enrollments in third-year language courses. Since students are arriving more prepared for language study and many are entering directly into second-year courses and completing the language requirement by the end of their freshman year, some have decided to continue their study of language and may eventually minor or even major in a language.

In addition to the change we have noted in students with the implementation of the proficiency-based language requirement, we have also noticed an increase in the level of administrative support for the language programs. Because of the proficiency-based graduation requirement, we have been able to make a very convincing case to the deans for the need to limit class enrollments in order to better prepare students to actually communicate in the language. Between 1985 and 1990, class size limits for French, German, and Spanish were lowered from 25 to 22 students. Targeted limits of 20 in first-year and 18 in second-year courses are to be phased in over the next few years.

As a result of the new language requirement, the involvement of TAs in the language program has also changed. Teaching assistants' frustration with large class size has obviously disappeared as the number of students per section has been reduced. However, TAs now feel more pressure than they did under the old requirement: they are more accountable for the quality of instruction than in the past, since it is unacceptable for a student to pass the second-year course sequence and yet be unable to pass the Graduation Proficiency Tests. We have noticed an increase in peer pressure among the TAs to avoid giving away grades and to uphold strict standards of performance. After a period of transition, most TAs have responded very favorably to the changed working conditions, and some have created supplementary reading and listening materials for the first- and second-year programs. They are also aware of an increased level of respect for their work from graduate faculty and advisers, who have finally recognized that language teaching in a proficiency-oriented program requires special training and expertise.

We are concerned, however, that the workload for TAs has increased too much with the proficiency-based requirement. TAs are expected to evaluate the Entrance and Graduation Writing and Speaking Tests. This increase in the workload has been handled differently by the three departments and is still under consideration. The French and German departments require TAs to rate the tests as part of their TA appointments. In the French department this work is done in lieu of assisting a professor in a large lecture class, as the number of English-language culture courses, such as literature in translation, has dwindled with the change in the requirement. Spanish Department TAs are required to evaluate exams during orientation week each fall as part of their regular appointments; however, after concern was expressed by the TAs over grading during the rest of the academic year, TAs are now paid an hourly wage to rate proficiency exams at other times. Since this is a College of Liberal Arts initiative and should not be the sole responsibility of the language departments, we hope that funding for the evaluation of these exams will eventually come from the College of Liberal Arts budget.

A final change caused by the new language requirement involves our positions as DLIs. First and foremost, we have experienced a tremendous increase in our workloads. During the initial years of implementation, we were expected to carry out proficiency test development in the four skill areas, make the necessary adjustments in course curricula, improve the training of the TAs and prepare them for the new requirement and the evaluation of the proficiency tests, and participate in outreach programs to inform high school teachers and counselors of the change

in the requirements. We did all this with no additional release time or administrative help. At first, our sense of ghettoization increased, rather than decreased, since our colleagues in literature and linguistics were no more involved in the language program than they had been originally, and the burden of implementation fell on us.

However, we also began to note an increased respect for our positions as DLIs. Colleagues and deans were aware that the implementation could not be carried out without us, and there was a recognition of the need for special expertise to carry out the direction of the language programs. It was no longer assumed that someone without proper training could do it effectively. The nonparticipation of our colleagues seemed to be due more to the fact that they lacked the proper qualifications to participate in the language program, rather than from the disdain for anything related to language instruction that is frequent at large research institutions.

For intellectual and moral support we formed a new coalition of colleagues from across departments and across colleges. This team included the DLIs of French, German, and Spanish; the Director of Testing, Dale L. Lange; the Director of the Language Center, Nancy Stenson; and the Assistant to the Director/Coordinator of Special Projects of Student Academic Support Services, Lynn Anderson Scott. This team worked through the details of the implementation process, and we still meet regularly to discuss problems as they arise and to determine future needs of the testing project and the language programs.

The increase in respect for the position of DLI has also translated into material support from colleagues and deans. Specifically, because of the increase in the workload and the DLIs' desire for release time from the duties involved in directing the language program, the Department of French and Italian made a strong case to the deans for the need for another faculty line. Another faculty member was hired in fall 1989, and she and Betsy Barnes will rotate the directorship of the language program on a three-year basis. The Department of German and Dutch has made a similiar recommendation, but it has not yet been approved by the deans. It is expected that the Department of Spanish and Portuguese may eventually follow the example that has been set by the other departments.

Future Directions

There are a number of steps that remain to be taken at the University of Minnesota. Since 1986 when the new requirement was first implemented, we have been revising one working set of exams. Development of alternate versions of the exams is now underway, and we eventually

plan to use a computerized test bank that will generate multiple versions of the tests. There have been numerous requests that we market the exams, but we will be unable to do so until we have multiple versions of the tests and have been able to carry out studies of their reliability and validity. To carry out the research and development that should accompany this initiative, we hope to hire a permanent director of testing, who will have a faculty line in one of the language departments or in the College of Education. This individual would be responsible for the day-to-day administration of the testing program and would be expected to develop a coherent plan for research related to the tests. Although the position request has already been presented to the deans of the College of Liberal Arts, the position has not yet been approved.

The new requirement has increased our ties to departments in the social sciences which are now taking advantage of the increased number of students who are completing the language requirement at an early stage of their studies. For example, the Institute of International Studies, which has over 400 majors who all minor in a second language, received a Title VI grant from the U.S. Department of Education, designating it as an undergraduate National Resource Center in International Studies. One of the projects that it has pursued as a part of that grant is the "Integration of Foreign Language Usage and Materials into Regular Content Courses." A foreign language component, for which students receive one credit, has been added to regular courses taught in English in content areas such as political science and international relations. For example, one such course is "Latin American Government and Politics." Students in the foreign language component of that course read articles in Spanish, preferably ones that have not been translated into English and that add a new perspective on the lectures and readings assigned in English for the main course. A diversity of texts is chosen to expose students to different types of language as well as to different political sectors. Listening materials such as speeches and interviews have also been added. Students meet once a week for two hours to discuss in Spanish the assigned materials. Students in these classes have evaluated the experience very positively.

Such content courses will be expanded in the future, thanks to NEH funding of an Institute of International Studies' grant application for foreign language study across the curriculum. Over a three-year period beginning in the summer of 1990, eighteen faculty will prepare content courses in political science, sociology, history, and geography to be taught in a second language. Faculty in the social sciences will be paired with language/literature faculty to aid in the development of curricula appropriate to students' levels of proficiency. The languages in which

these courses will be taught include French, German, Spanish, Italian, and Russian. Students who complete a certain number of these courses will graduate with "language distinction," an honor that will be recorded on their transcript.

These initiatives have had an impact on us as DLIs, since we have been asked to serve as consultants for the implementation of these initiatives, and our expertise is recognized not only within our departments, but also within the College of Liberal Arts and the University as a whole. While our workloads have greatly increased, our sense of ghettoization has decreased considerably.

Conclusion

The national trend to reinstate and/or increase study of foreign languages at the high school and university levels will most likely continue as the pressure grows to better prepare students for an increasingly interconnected and interdependent world. The initiative undertaken at the University of Minnesota to change the language requirement from seat-time to proficiency is part of a much broader plan at our institution to internationalize the curriculum. The change in the language requirement is thus the first step in preparing students to use a second language to explore the ideas and research of others and to think critically about their own culture and values.

Works Cited

ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines. Yonkers, NY: ACTFL Materials Center, 1986.

Brod, Richard & Monique Lapointe. "The MLA Survey of Foreign Language Entrance and Degree Requirements, 1987-88." *ADFL Bulletin* 20, ii (1989): 17.

Byrnes, Heidi. "How Do You Get There from Here? Articulating the Foreign Language Major Program." *ADFL Bulletin* 20, i (1988): 35-38.

Cheney, Lynne V. *Fifty Hours: A Core Curriculum for College Students*. Washington, DC: NEH, 1989.

Dvorak, Trisha. "The Ivory Ghetto: The Place of the Language Program Coordinator in a Research Institution." *Hispania* 69 (1986): 217-22.

Horwitz, Elaine K. "The Beliefs about Language Learning of Beginning University Foreign Language Students." *Modern Language Journal* 72 (1988): 283-94.

Klee, Carol A. & Elizabeth S. Rogers. "Status of Articulation: Placement, Advanced Placement Credit, and Course Options." *Hispania* 72 (1989): 264-74.

Morello, Joseph. "Attitudes of Students of French Toward Required Language Study." *Foreign Language Annals* 21 (1988): 435-54.

Nichols, Johanna. "Language Study, International Study, and Education." *Profession 88*. New York: MLA, 1988: 10-17.

Nostrand, Howard Lee. "Culture in Language Teaching: The Next Phase." *ADFL Bulletin* 20, i (1988): 29-34.

Patrikis, Peter C. "Reports and Reforms: Where Are the Foreign Languages?" *ADFL Bulletin* 20, i (1988): 14-19.

Perkins, Jean A. "The Value of Foreign Language Study." *ADFL Bulletin* 20, i (1988): 24-25.

Team Teaching French with Teaching Assistants

Theodore E. D. Braun and Bonnie A. Robb
University of Delaware

Introduction

One of the major challenges confronting foreign-language programs in American universities has been the widespread use of teaching assistants (TAs) and relatively inexperienced part-time instructors in the elementary and intermediate courses. This challenge, already decades old, is unlikely to disappear in the 1990s, and in fact—if projections for a greater need for high school and college foreign-language teachers are accurate—it is likely to become even more acute as more and more TAs and part-timers are appointed. Ways must be found to assimilate these inexperienced people into elementary and intermediate programs more effectively, in order that the quality of instruction in these courses be as high and as consistent as possible. In this article, we report on an experience with team teaching at the University of Delaware which has proven helpful in meeting this challenge.

A Departmental Decision to Team Teach in a New Course Structure

Team teaching was instituted by the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures in new three-course elementary/intermediate sequences in French, Spanish, and German in fall 1987. Among the motivations for initiating team teaching in our programs were the desire to provide a variety of accents and voices for the students and the hope that this variety as well as different personality and classroom management

styles would enhance student interest. The system adopted by the department called for each course in the sequence to meet five times weekly, with one instructor (usually an experienced veteran) teaching on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, and the other (usually a TA or a part-timer) on Tuesday and Thursday. Within the overall framework of this scheduling pattern, the faculty teaching each language was given the freedom to work out the details of implementing team teaching in its program.

One of the objectives of instituting the three-course sequence was to permit students beginning the language to complete the required sequence in one year: for instance, French students could take FR 105 in the fall, FR 106 in the winter (either on campus or in our new winter session program in Caen), and FR 107 in the spring; those entering at the 106 or 107 levels could take the next level of courses either on campus or in Caen. Another objective was to provide better overall instruction than had been possible in our traditional three-hours-per-week program by providing students with a more intensive, five-hours-per-week classroom experience. An apparent result of this program has been a slight increase in the number of minors and majors (in the order of 20%-30% or 8-10 new students in each category), and—especially among students who have spent the winter session in Caen—a considerable increase in enrollment in our postrequirement and upper-level courses. The German and Spanish faculties have had similar results.

The French Connection: Teams of Equal Partners

The French faculty, in a preliminary survey of the literature on the use of teaching teams in the foreign language classroom, found very little on the subject: there were reports on the Rassias method and an article by Magnan (1987) describing a team-teaching experiment at the University of Wisconsin which had just appeared in the *French Review*.[1] The modes described by Magnan and by Rassias,[2] as well as other cases known to us anecdotally, all called for an experienced teacher to present concepts and a TA or part-timer to lead practice sessions. While mindful that these approaches had yielded good results, we were unable to follow them closely: on the one hand, we were obliged to keep each section of the courses intact for both teachers, in contrast to the large class/small practice sections framework used by others; and on the other hand, we did not want to run the risk of having the students view the inexperienced teachers' class hours as being less important than those of the more experienced teachers.[3]

Therefore, we determined that the two teachers of our team would each share in all teaching responsibilities. The novice as well as the

veteran would introduce creative activities and new curricular materials on their days in the classroom, thereby integrating inexperienced teachers fully and immediately into the program. Although for scheduling and other administrative purposes, the University of Delaware requires the use of the designations "primary" and "secondary," the two teachers were to be perceived by their students as equally important and as sharing the same work.[4] We hoped to mitigate or avert entirely the problem of difference in rank and degree of authority which Magnan noted the TAs in her program felt (p. 462).

We foresaw that this arrangement would be a challenging one, since such sharing would necessitate daily communication between the teammates. Like many instructors in multisection courses, we were accustomed to comparing notes and sharing ideas; but we saw from the start that team-teaching promised to give a new meaning to communication between colleagues and between faculty and TAs or part-timers.

The Curriculum

At the time the decision to institute team teaching was made, the French faculty was in the process of designing a syllabus-driven curriculum to clarify and codify the goals of each course in our elementary/intermediate program and to improve the articulation between courses. While the development of the new program syllabus was undertaken independently of the plans for team teaching, the coincidental implementation of the two innovations in the fall of 1987 was opportune. Since the close collaboration between two teachers sharing the instruction of a course necessitates a mutual understanding of course goals, the explicit formulation of these goals in the program syllabus is extremely useful for orienting the teams in their planning; furthermore, since students are also in possession of the syllabus, they can see how all activities of both instructors are aimed at achieving the stated goals.

The syllabus (see Appendix) consists of a statement of the overall program objectives, followed by a separate presentation of the goals for each individual course. The overall statement outlines the main topics or notions we want students to master, the skills needed to perform meaningfully in French, the vocabulary essential for accomplishing these tasks,[5] and the basic grammatical points without which the students cannot perform adequately. More detail is provided in the individual course descriptions, which list the proficiency goals, accuracy goals, topics, and cultural items specific to each course. The proficiency goals set for the three courses, which were defined in terms of the 1986 *ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines*, are Novice High, Intermediate Low, and Intermediate Mid, respectively.[6]

The accuracy goals consist of the basic grammatical and orthographical material taught at each level, with, however, a timetable that allows students to experiment with the new grammatical items before they are graded[7]—a practice which eases tensions in the classroom, as students are generally in command of new structures before they are graded on their use of them, and are therefore far less likely to overmonitor their speech production.[8] The main topics/notions and the cultural items are recycled throughout the three semesters' work, and are accompanied by progressively more complex and nuanced skills requirements.

In addition to the syllabus, students receive a day-by-day course schedule. Written tests occur at approximately 15-hour intervals, or about four per semester. There are two oral tests, the first occurring at about mid-point in the course, the other near the end. The fourth hour test and the final oral test are general in nature, and replace the standard final exam. In addition, students have quizzes and homework assignments; in FR 105, the quizzes are replaced by a series of writing workshops, in which the students learn to write first words and then sentences and paragraphs, and gradually increase the complexity of their sentence structures by adding adjectives and adjective clauses beginning with *qui* or *que*.

Instructional approaches are quite varied, but all aim at fostering both fluency and accuracy. After an initial 15-class-hour stretch of Total Physical Response (TPR)[9] enhanced by the department's locally-produced IBM vocabulary program,[10] then role playing, scenarios, small-group activities of all sorts, *sondages*, reports, and other communicative techniques are used, along with occasional drills on grammatical points and textbook/workbook exercises. The texts used help provide additional articulation between the levels, since for the most part they serve more than one course.

Team Teaching the Curriculum

The administrative structure of our team teaching program consists of three course coordinators, each of whom oversees one of the courses in the sequence, and a sequence supervisor who is concerned with assuring that the courses articulate as they are designed to do. The sequence supervisor and the course coordinators constitute the textbook-selection committee, an arrangement which facilitates proper articulation.

Before the beginning of the semester, each course coordinator convenes all teams teaching his/her particular course to review the goals of the course and to examine the calendar established by the coordinator for that semester. General guidelines regarding class attendance, participation, homework, testing, and grading are offered by the

coordinator at that time. It is then up to each team to work out in detail what its policies on these matters will be and to establish an efficient system of common bookkeeping. Involvement in this process constitutes a valuable apprenticeship in course management for the teaching assistant or part-timer.

During the semester, teammates meet weekly to make a general plan of the next week's activities: what will be done, when, by whom, and—often—how. They also arrange for communication with each other during the rest of the week, which is frequently handled by a notebook passed back and forth, with each teammate recording what was done in his or her class that day; in this manner the following day's lesson plan can be adjusted as necessary.

For instance, when the *passé composé* is introduced, the teammates must decide who will make the initial presentation and by means of what technique(s)—TPR, grammatical analysis, strategic interaction scenario, reading activity, etc. After the class meeting, the original presenter must report to his or her teammate what actually transpired during the lesson, whether the class as a whole and individual students in particular appeared to understand the concepts and to have grasped the forms, and what kinds of problems were encountered, and then make recommendations for adjustments to the plan necessitated by the team member's experience in class. This report is usually made in the team's notebook or by a telephone call.

When a quiz is to be given, the teammates decide on the format, on what day it will be given, and on who will grade it and according to what criteria. Exams are prepared and graded by the teammates in accordance with a format and grading criteria established by the course coordinator.

While each team has a significant degree of autonomy, there is continued contact between all instructors teaching the same course. The course coordinator holds course-wide planning sessions on a regular basis during the semester to ensure that goals, as plotted out in the syllabus, are being met and to give an opportunity for exchanging ideas and teaching techniques, working out problems, planning exams, and gathering suggestions for improving the course in subsequent semesters. These course-wide meetings guarantee some measure of uniformity among sections and enable teaching assistants to benefit from a broader base of shared ideas and to become aware of more general program concerns.

Course coordinators are convened regularly by the sequence supervisor to report on their respective courses and share the concerns of their instructors. These periodic meetings identify problem areas before they become too serious, and keep the persons responsible for the

different levels of instruction in close communication with one another. The sequence supervisor also organizes workshops pre-, mid-, and post-semester, to which all members of the teaching staff are invited. On these occasions demonstrations of teaching methods and communicative activities are offered by experienced staff members. These plenary meetings have also provided a forum for discussion and evaluation of our system of team teaching. The suggestions of teaching assistants and part-timers as well as veteran teachers have thus been taken into account as our team teaching program has evolved.

In these ways, we attempt to surround the inexperienced TAs and part-timers with guidance and support, to engage them in discussion of the problems and challenges they are facing in the classroom, and to help them to analyze and improve their performance.

Advantages and Disadvantages of Team Teaching

The Point of View of the Faculty

From the start, we discovered as a group both the difficulties and the advantages of team teaching. The major concern voiced at first was, not surprisingly, the extraordinary need for meetings. It was not easy to fit so many into already busy schedules. However, these frequent meetings, initially seen only as a disadvantage, have come to be recognized as an advantage as well. They provide an occasion for very productive brainstorming; the ideas which result are abundant and creative, and can actually reduce the amount of time that needs to be spent individually on preparation. It seems that two (or more) heads are indeed better than one. If one teammate is having difficulty finding a way to present a lesson or is not satisfied with the class response, the second teacher can try a different approach.

Teachers have discovered that discussing and evaluating activities together help them keep their activities purposeful, since explaining or justifying ideas to each other forces each to re-evaluate his or her own. As one assistant professor said, "I found that teaching the same course with another person over the whole semester was an enormous and invaluable source of moral support, as well as practical support: two lots of ideas to draw on, someone to share the workload with, discuss problems, laugh, etc." An experienced instructor noted, in a practical vein, "Teachers can replace each other easily in case of illness (they know the students, and they know what is being done in the class)."

Another advantage of team teaching is that oral exams can be administered in half the time if each teammate tests half the class; or, if they prefer, they can work together on oral testing, allowing one person to conduct the interview while the other observes and takes notes. This is also less disquieting to the students, who can be unnerved by seeing their teacher writing virtually constantly while they are speaking; the practice of having two teachers conduct the oral exam, while it might not produce better results, does provide a more relaxed atmosphere for conversation.

Finally, teachers feel that grading is more objective, not only in the oral exams but also in assessing written work and class performance, since the two instructors tend to confirm (or, more rarely, to compensate for) each other's grades over the course of the semester, and since they jointly decide the students' final grades. Moreover, in order to assure some degree of uniformity in grading, the team must discuss in considerable detail which aspects of the students' progress are to be graded at a particular point, and how the grading scale will work. This practice also leads to a greater degree of objectivity, in that the criteria, established beforehand, are verbalized and made more explicit than is the usual practice in a single-teacher situation.

Nevertheless, despite these advantages, meetings continue to pose a challenge. Finding times for meetings with different teammates can be difficult—for the TAs because their schedules include hours when they are taking classes, in addition to the hours when they are teaching; for the experienced instructors because they teach several courses and therefore have more meetings to schedule with different teammates. This, their most frequently-stated problem, has been lessened by an attempt to team primary instructors with no more than two different TAs. But another problem persists: the day-to-day communication between teammates. As one instructor explains, "Partners cannot possibly know everything that happens in the other teacher's class. Although notes are kept and phone calls are made, we inevitably forget [some of] the details (e.g., every single vocab. word introduced, students who won't be in class a certain date, etc.)." Experienced teachers also complain that, because they give so many activities and ideas to TAs and beginning instructors, they find that their partners sometimes seem to rely on these ideas and activities rather than create new ones of their own. In the most extreme cases, experienced teachers have felt that they were in effect doing the planning for all five class meetings of the week.

The work of the senior instructor in such a team is in reality a form of mentoring. Although it is time consuming, the regular staff perceives that this mentoring process is not without its rewards, and that the system of team teaching we practice has significant benefits.

The Point of View of the Teaching Assistants and the Part-timers

For their part, the teaching assistants and the part-timers have expressed great satisfaction with their experience in the team-teaching program, especially for their first year. Although administratively "secondary" instructors, they enjoy equal status in the classroom. They do not have the burden of full responsibility for running the course, yet they are being initiated into all aspects of that responsibility. For them, the extensive contact with older faculty members offers guidance and, when needed, reassurance. Those with no previous teaching experience have occasionally been disconcerted by the necessity of changing lesson plans at the last moment when informed that their class was not ready for the lesson they had prepared for the next day; however, they have found the collaborating instructor consistently helpful in providing ideas for making the necessary adjustments. These findings are similar to those reported by Magnan (p. 462), who found that TAs perceived in their team-teaching experience a "benefit...for their own professional training: by observing and working closely with a professor, they felt that they gained in expertise, objectivity, and professionalism."

Overall, there seems to be a good symbiosis in the situation, with the teaching assistants learning from their more experienced colleagues, and the latter in turn benefiting from the enthusiasm of their junior teammates. Pleased with their success, TAs have expressed a desire to teach a course on their own, once they have learned the ropes (a finding consistent with Magnan, pp. 462-63). We are considering ways of accommodating them in this reasonable request.

The Point of View of the Students

The students, too, appear to find the team-teaching experience generally to their liking. They rate their courses at the department average of about 4 on a 5-point scale; this appears especially impressive in view of the fact that half of most teams consists of an inexperienced teacher. Furthermore, a formal survey of several sections and anecdotal evidence from the other sections on all three levels of instruction—written comments on course-evaluation forms and remarks made informally to teachers—suggests a high degree of satisfaction. Comments focus on three main points: first, a variety of teaching styles and accents is provided; second, student interest is maintained; third, the risk of having a poorly taught course is diminished.

One student, for instance, writes: "Both teachers' aspects, ideas, views, knowledge can be used to teach students." The fact that teacher talents tend to be complementary is one of the most frequently-cited advantages of team-teaching from the students' point of view: "You can

hear two different accents, and get a different perspective on the language." "Both instructors contain a wealth of information they can share with their students, thereby getting two reactions on a particular place or way of life." On maintaining a high interest level, students comment: "It's a change from having the same teacher every day, which can be quite boring." "It is often a good thing, especially when a class meets every day. You do not become tired of the same style of teaching day after day." "Minimizes boredom." And, on the quality of individual instructors, students write: "If it is difficult to understand one, the other may be clearer." "One does seem less formal than the other, funner [*sic*]." Negative comments are few, and even when caveats are offered, it is most often in a constructive context, as in this comment: "Team teaching works well if the two profs are in constant communication." Another student notes: "Even though some material is repeated, it can be seen as a review." Still, a perceived breakdown of communication between the two instructors has caused unmitigated negative reaction in a small number of students, such as the one who wrote, "The two teachers should communicate more so they know what each other is doing and so they can tell the students what's going on."

These typical student reactions, generally if not universally accentuating the positive, seem to indicate a high degree of satisfaction with the team-teaching aspect of the program. (Similar general satisfaction was found in Magnan, pp. 459-61.) Indeed, our students' reactions to the team of teachers often echo those of Magnan's students, one of whom said (p. 460): "It breaks up the monotony of having the same class five days a week, and also provides different learning experiences on different days (teaching styles, point of view, accents...)."

Conclusions

The organization of the team-taught syllabus-driven curriculum has proven to be very satisfactory, allowing as it does maximum communication among all persons involved in the elementary/intermediate program. Each team meets regularly and frequently to map out strategies and approaches; at each level, the course coordinators meet often and regularly with the instructional staff, and can help train new TAs and lecturers; and the sequence supervisor and course coordinators get together periodically to choose materials and to keep the articulation between the courses as smooth as possible.

The team-teaching experience has thus been a positive one. The high level of cross-fertilization of ideas and activities between team partners and, in fact, among all faculty members, has translated into a more varied and stimulating atmosphere in the classroom, and students have

expressed their appreciation of this in generally positive course evaluations. Students agree that team teaching, by exposing them constantly to two points of view, two accents, and two teaching styles, has enriched their experience in our courses, providing a variety crucial in an intensive, five-days-a-week schedule. The faculty and the TAs have noted that, while maintaining the close communication necessary with one's teammate(s) is a real challenge, team teaching has succeeded in improving communication among all faculty members, which has at the same time favored articulation between courses. After some three years of team teaching, we are convinced that it is helping us to make our program stronger and more effective.

Nevertheless, our experience also suggests that it might be a good idea to limit team teaching to first-year TAs and beginning instructors, both because of the practical problems noted above—the enormous expenditure of time and energy required to meet regularly and to coordinate efforts within each team—and because the TAs' request to have a chance to teach on their own is well founded. If in fact we are training them to become effective teachers, they will need opportunities to work independently once they have acquired the skills necessary to conduct a class on their own. Thanks to their team teaching experience, TAs can build a solid foundation in the practice of our craft which will better enable them to perform as skilled professionals.

Notes

1. For purposes of this report, a more recent search was undertaken, with similarly meager results: computer searches of ERIC and the MLA Bibliography yielded only one (as it turned out) inapplicable entry on team teaching in foreign languages; searches of the *Modern Language Journal*, *Foreign Language Annals*, and the *French Review* yielded only Magnan's article. We are aware of the existence of other team-teaching efforts (for example, at the University of Texas at Austin and at Simon Fraser University) but our knowledge is only anecdotal: since 1980 (the beginning limit of our search) almost nobody has written on the subject. It would appear that our colleagues have not shared in print the good and bad experiences they have had, or the results of their research in this field.
2. See the list of works cited. Rassias and Rassias-inspired modes like Otto W. Johnston's at the University of Florida, make extensive use of undergraduates to conduct the drill sections. Most other modes, including Magnan's and ours, make use of graduate teaching assistants.
3. In fact, we subsequently learned that in our four-classroom-hours-per-week courses, team-taught on a 3-1 basis, the TA or part-timer's role was virtually untenable. These courses have since been phased out. We attempted at first to team-teach these courses, but with the secondary instructors' time being reduced to one hour per week we discovered that students did not respect

them as equal partners, and tended to be absent much more frequently on their teaching day. As a result, these courses were taught subsequently by a single instructor until they were phased out.

4. Since we were obliged to initiate the team-teaching program within months, we did not have the time or the opportunity to set up a scientific, controlled experiment contrasting student performance in one-teacher sections versus student performance in team-taught sections, or their performance in classes taught by teams consisting of an experienced teacher and a TA or part-timer versus those taught by teams consisting of two experienced teachers.

5. Savard and Richards' book was an invaluable aid in choosing the vocabulary for the first semester's work and for the IBM program we have incorporated into the course work.

6. These goals are just that: goals. They are not requirements for passing the courses, and for this reason we do not claim to have a proficiency-ordered curriculum. The goals are, however, used to determine grade levels, with a B awarded to students who achieve these goals on the final oral and written exams, and higher or lower grades assigned to those who surpass them or fall below them.

7. Students have five class hours to use the new points before we actively correct them, and another five hours before we grade their oral and written work on these topics. The original intervals were ten hours, but it soon became obvious that this was an excessive amount of time, and might even have been counter-productive, in that some students were beginning to "learn" their errors.

8. Programs described in Rosenthal (1987) and Pons-Ridler (1987) have some parallels to our program and methods. Rosenthal's experiments and experiences are similar to ours, and have produced similar results; we believe, however, that the team-teaching aspect of our program has made possible a degree of success we would not otherwise have achieved, and has added a dimension to the students' (and the teachers'!) classroom experience not attainable in a single-teacher environment. We have, as a matter of informal policy, been for some years following many of the guidelines Pons-Ridler summarizes so well in her article; this has allowed us to concentrate on more essential matters of communication.

9. This approach was invented by psychologist James Asher in the 1960s. A good presentation of his ideas and of the psychological basis of TPR can be found in Asher (1981).

As we practice TPR, students are discouraged from speaking French during the first eight to ten hours of class. During this time, by acting out commands, listening to the instructor speak to them in simple but complete sentences utilizing highlighted vocabulary items, students develop in just two weeks an active vocabulary of about 200 words, plus an assortment of noun markers; they also learn the basic sentence structure of French, and to an amazing extent the pronunciation of the language; in short, they appear to internalize the language process.

The use of TPR has had an important side effect: the real beginners are less intimidated by those false beginners who somehow manage to get into a first-semester course, and feel more confident of their own abilities once they begin speaking. TPR also develops the students' listening skills.

10. The vocabulary lesson used is *Words*, developed by Theodore E. D. Braun and George W. Mulford. It is based on the word-usage list researched and published by Savard and Richards. We also make use of a locally-produced verb morphology lesson called *Verbs*, developed by Theodore E. D. Braun, George W. Mulford, and Bonnie A. Robb.

Works Cited

ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines. Yonkers, NY: ACTFL Materials Center, 1986.

Asher, James J. *Learning Another Language through Actions: The Complete Teacher's Guidebook*. Third Printing. Los Gatos, CA: Sky Oaks Productions, 1981.

Capretz, Pierre. *French in Action* videotapes, Washington, DC: The Annenberg-CPB Project, 1987.

Johnston, Otto W. "The Intensive Language Model at Florida." *Methods That Work*. Ed. John W. Oller & Patricia A. Richard-Amato. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1983: 348-61.

Magnan, Sally Sieloff. "Teaming Teachers and Modifying Class Size: An Experiment in First-Year French." *French Review* 60 (1987): 454-65.

Pons-Ridler, Suzanne. "Orthographe: pourquoi être plus royaliste que le roi!" *French Review* 61 (1987): 229-38.

Rassias, John A. "New Dimensions in Language Training: The Dartmouth College Experiment." *Methods That Work*. Ed. John W. Oller & Patricia A. Richard-Amato. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1983: 363-73; see especially pp. 366-70.

Rosenthal, Alan S. "Learning and Retaining through Context and Imagination." *French Review* 61 (1987): 219-28.

Savard, Jean-Guy & Jack Richards. *Les Indices d'utilité du vocabulaire fondamental français*. Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 1970.

Appendix

Syllabus for French 105, 106, 107 Sequence

Overall Program Objectives

By the end of FR 107, students should be able to satisfy most survival needs and limited social demands in French-speaking countries. Students will be expected to handle colloquial greeting/introducing/leave-taking routines, as well as to have a working knowledge of lodging- and meal-related matters. They should be able to discuss and to understand matters of personal history and immediate experience, including career goals, plans, family background, courses taken or to be taken, and different jobs held. Students should show some spontaneity in language production, although their fluency is likely to be uneven.

Errors in syntax and morphology will occur; however, evidence of grammatical accuracy in basic sentence structure and subject-verb agreement, noun-adjective agreement, use of verb tenses, use of direct and indirect object pronouns and of the basic relative and interrogative pronouns can be expected. Students will be able to use most question forms and use the most common negative expressions. While word order is in general under control, some errors will occur in more complex structures. Pronunciation will be comprehensible, but students may have difficulty in producing certain sounds in certain positions or combinations, and speech will be hesitant at times.

Students will be able to read and comprehend material intended for the general public as well as authentic or edited texts such as newspaper articles, social announcements or invitations, letters, and some literature. Students should also be able to read and understand the main ideas or points in more technical material related to their major subject or a personal interest. Students will be able to use the context of what they read to extract meaning, and to use a dictionary to look up the meaning of indispensable words or expressions.

Students will be able to write general messages, notes, informal letters and postcards, and to fill out forms of a kind used in travel situations. They will also be able to write compositions containing descriptions, narrations, and their views on topics of interest to them. Students' writing will be intelligible, personal and original, although a variety of formal errors can be expected. They will have a broad functional active vocabulary.

Evaluation will consist of both oral and written measures of functional ability in French. Scoring techniques will thus reflect students' fluency, originality, breadth of vocabulary, grammatical accuracy, critical skills, and global ability in French.

French 105 (Hours 1-67)

Main Topics/Notions

Greetings and introductions
Parts of the body; health/sickness
The family
School, subjects, majors
Work, careers
Leisure activities, sports
Vacations, travel
Plans for the future (winter, summer, career)
Meals and foods
Stores, shopping
Clothing
Buying, selling, paying

Culture

Geography of France (main cities, rivers, etc.)
Some traditions, holidays, national cultural interests
Daily lives of young French people

Skills

Greetings; introducing oneself and others
Talking about oneself and one's family, friends, activities, and occupations
Listening to other people talk about these things
Interacting with others at the elementary level
Asking survival questions
Asking for help
Asking for and giving directions
Writing words, sentences, paragraphs in simple French
Filling out forms (hotel, university, etc.)
Reading simple material (signs, schedules, stories)
Understanding basic cultural patterns
Ordering a meal
Shopping

Main Grammar Points

ACTIVE
Basic sentence structure
Commands
Present indicative
Subject pronouns
Direct object pronouns (introduced ca. hour 40)
Future with *aller*
Articles
Reflexive verbs
Modal auxiliaries (*vouloir, pouvoir, devoir,* etc.)
Interrogation by intonation
Relative pronouns *qui* and *que*
Simple negation (*ne...pas*)
Noun-adjective agreement
Passé composé (introduced ca. hour 50)

PASSIVE
Indirect object pronouns
Interrogation by inversion

Vocabulary

Important items associated with main topics/notions, culture, skills
Colors, sizes
Time expressions
Weather expressions
Prepositions and adverbs of location
Numerals, dates
Days of the week, divisions of the day, months, seasons

Proficiency Goal

Novice High

Accuracy Goals

Subject-verb agreement for present indicative (corrected starting ca. hour 15, graded for written work ca. hour 20, graded for oral work ca. hour 25)
Noun-adjective agreement, (corrected starting ca. hour 20, graded for written work ca. hour 25, graded for oral work ca. hour 30)
Direct object pronouns (corrected starting ca. hour 45, graded starting ca. hour 50)
Comprehensible pronunciation
Solid knowledge of vocabulary
Use of *passé composé* (corrected starting ca. hour 55, graded starting ca. hour 60)

Materials

TEXT: *Petits contes sympathiques*
OTHER: Computer programs on IBM micros (WORDS, VERBS, TOUCHÉ, etc.)
Slides and overheads
Maps
Audiotapes
Videotapes (*French in Action*)

French 106 (Hours 68-135)

In addition to French 105 material:

Main Topics/Notions

More on sports and leisure activities
More on meals and foods
More on traveling
Urban life in France
Study abroad/French education system
Important/popular people
Francophone countries (Canada, Caribbean, European, African)
Everyday problems
Women, young people
More on vacations: changing currency, shopping, expressing preferences

Culture

Regional differences
Society, government, politics
Patterns relating to family, traditions, interpersonal relations, celebrations, festivities

Skills

Talking and writing about oneself and others
Finding out information, ideas, opinions about important persons, places, issues
Finding your way around a city, a country
Reading for general information
Writing descriptive and narrative prose

Main Grammar Points

ACTIVE
Review direct object pronouns
Imperfect (introduced ca. hour 75)
Use of *imparfait* and *passé composé*
Indirect object pronouns (introduced ca. hour 90)
Present subjunctive (introduced ca. hour 95)
The indefinite pronoun *on*
Review/refinement of imperative (ca. hour 110)
Indirect discourse
Future tense (introduced ca. hour 120)
Interrogation by inversion

PASSIVE
Passive voice
Relative pronouns as objects of prepositions
Interrogative pronouns as objects of prepositions
Stressed forms of pronouns
Double object pronouns

Vocabulary

Greater variety and detail to lead to greater skill and ease of expression in main topics/notions, culture, skill
Development of passive vocabulary for reading ordinary prose passages in books, newspapers, etc.

Proficiency Goal

Intermediate Low

Accuracy Goals

Correct forms and basic uses of imperfect (corrected starting ca. hour 80, graded starting ca. hour 85)
Correct use of direct object pronouns (graded starting ca. hour 70)
Correct use of indirect object pronouns (corrected starting ca. hour 100, graded starting ca. hour 110)

Correct forms and basic uses of present subjunctive (corrected starting ca. hour 100, graded starting ca. hour 105)
Correct forms and uses of future (corrected starting ca. hour 125, graded starting ca. hour 130)
Correct use of indirect discourse (verb tense, use of *que*)

Materials

TEXTS: *Rendez-vous; Contes pour débutants, I*
OTHER: Computer programs on IBM micros (VERBS, TOUCHÉ, etc.)
Maps
Audiotapes
Videotapes *(French in Action)*

French 107 (Hours 136-202)

In addition to French 105 and 106 material:

Main Topics/Notions

More on entertainment and leisure activities
More on dining out and ordering food
Reading extensively in different kinds of material
Topics raised in material read (short stories, articles, essays, etc.)
More on interpersonal relationships

Culture

General cultural issues
French and Francophone countries' main values and traditions
Sociopolitical ideas typical of France and of Francophone countries

Skills

More on filling out forms
Making comments, expressing preferences and opinions
Defending opinions
Making small talk and keeping listener interested
Expressing agreement and disagreement
Defending own positions and those of others
Negociating an outcome
Reporting current events
Simple analyses of themes, characters, plots, motives in material read
Writing critical essays and compositions to discuss ideas
Talking and writing about oneself or others

Main Grammar Points

ACTIVE
Review future
Conditional (introduced ca. hour 140)
Review and refinement of main grammar points covered in previous levels, with a focus on improving oral and written expression in French
Past conditional, *plus-que-parfait*

PASSIVE
Reading tenses

Vocabulary

Development of vocabulary needed for topics/notions, culture, skills
Systematic review of earlier levels' vocabulary items

Proficiency Goal

Intermediate Mid or High

Accuracy Goals

Correct forms and uses of conditional (corrected starting ca. hour 145, graded starting ca. hour 150)
Correct use of relative pronouns as objects of prepositions, in writing

Materials

TEXTS: *Interaction*; *Autour de la littérature*
OTHER: Computer programs on IBM micros (VERBS, TOUCHÉ, etc.)
Maps
Slides, projections
Audiotapes
Videotapes (*French in Action*)

On Apples and Oranges: The Effects of Integrating Beginners and False Beginners in Elementary French Classes

Steven J. Loughrin-Sacco
Michigan Technological University

Among the many pedagogical and administrative problems confronting foreign language programs in the 1990s is the common practice of placing beginners and false beginners together in elementary foreign language classes. In a common scenario, students with no prior foreign language study struggle to learn in the same elementary language class with students who have already had one or more years of high school French, Spanish, or German. Klee and Rodgers (1989) reported, in a nationwide survey, that the percentage of false beginners in elementary classes was as high as 92% with a national average of 57%. Other studies corroborate their findings: Hagiwara (1983) cited 62%, Halff and Frisbie (1977) 67%, and Loughrin-Sacco, Bommarito, and Sweet (1988) 56% at their respective institutions. For many false beginners, retaking elementary foreign language in college is an opportunity to enhance their grade point average while concentrating on their other courses. For beginners, taking foreign language with false beginners is often an anxiety-ridden endeavor that can inhibit learning and negatively affect their feelings toward foreign language study. The problems arising from

integrating beginners and false beginners have far-reaching consequences for foreign language programs: students' experiences at the elementary level often influence their decision to pursue or terminate *further* foreign language study.

Although others have discussed the problems of integrating beginners and false beginners (Klee & Rodgers 1989; Hagiwara, 1983; and Halff & Frisbie, 1977), this essay examines, from the learner's perspective, the effects of integrating beginners and false beginners in elementary French classes. The learner's perspective is reported through two studies. The identifying study was a year-long ethnography of an elementary French class. The main study was an investigation of foreign language classroom anxiety using Horwitz's anxiety scale (Horwitz, Horwitz & Cope, 1986) and subsequent interview data from selected beginners and false beginners.

Prior Research

The problem of integrating beginners and false beginners in elementary language classes has been addressed directly or indirectly since the 1960s when Aleamoni and Spencer (1968) and Spencer and Flaugher (1967) examined placement testing procedures and the issue of high school and college equivalency in language teaching. In their search for appropriate placement procedures, these researchers consistently found that the traditional formula of one year of high school foreign language being equivalent to one semester of college foreign language was invalid at their institutions. A decade or so later, Hagiwara (1983) also found the formula invalid in placing students at the University of Michigan. Hagiwara reported that, after the drop/add deadline and placement adjustments, 98% of students with two years of high school French, 77% with three years, and 49% with four years needed to repeat one or two semesters of elementary French. By discarding the traditional formula, many colleges and universities found themselves allowing more and more false beginners to enroll in elementary language courses.

Despite the need for remedial work for false beginners, Hagiwara found that they consistently received higher grades on quizzes and exams than true beginners. Halff and Frisbie (1977), in a study at the University of Illinois, found similar results when comparing the grades of beginners and false beginners with two years of high school French. Their data revealed that course grades were positively related to the amount of previous high school French study. Beginners, for example, received 16% fewer "A's" and 12% more "C's" than false beginners with two years of high school French. Table 1 shows that out of 82

beginners, only 7% received an "A," 49% received a "B," 33% received a "C," 11% received a "D," and 1% earned a failing grade. Out of 132 students with two years of high school French, 23% received an "A," 49% received a "B," 21% received a "C," 5% received a "D," and 2% received a failing grade. Course grades accounted for only a part of the problem of having integrated elementary French classes. Halff and Frisbie noted that the attrition rate among beginners in the first semester French course was 19% versus 4% for false beginners. Data from these two Big Ten universities illustrate the disadvantages beginners face in elementary language courses and the need to provide course options for false beginners. (See Table 1.)

Table 1
Percentage Distribution of Course Grades for Students with No High School French and Students with Two Years of High School French *(from Halff & Frisbie, 1977)*

Years of High School French	Number of Students	A	B	C	D	E
0	82	7	49	33	11	1
2	132	23	49	21	5	2

In 1989, Klee and Rodgers reported the results of a comprehensive survey that details the concerns of language coordinators throughout the United States. Fifty-eight institutions of varying sizes from 27 different states, representing over 800,000 students participated in the survey. Among numerous issues shared, the respondents consistently cited problems with students who had one or more years of high school foreign language.

The most frequently cited problem was that of false beginners placing themselves too low or purposely performing poorly on placement exams in order to enroll in elementary classes. One professor noted: "Many students who have had three years of high school Spanish enroll in first semester Spanish to get an easy 'A'" (p. 766). Another educator complained: "We have real problems with students who purposefully score low on the placement examination so that they can get an easy grade. This one is a tough one to handle and we have no answer for it yet" (p. 766). Several respondents also complained of

(1) the inadequate preparation of false beginners for college-level foreign language courses, (2) language loss encountered by false beginners who had discontinued foreign language study, and (3) a lack of course options for false beginners who fit into neither elementary nor intermediate courses.

The next logical step in researching the potential problems of integrating beginners and false beginners in elementary language courses involves the study of both groups in their learning environment. In foreign language acquisition research, however, integrating beginners and false beginners appears to be an ignored or tolerated factor in language learning. Bailey's diary study (1980), a notable exception, vividly described what it was like to be a true beginner in a required graduate reading class of French. Bailey, a foreign language researcher, and a beginner among false beginners in this class, exhibited many of the same feelings of inadequacy and frustration as 19-year-old undergraduate students. At the end of the first week she wrote:

> I'm absolutely worn out. I floundered through the class making at least four stupid mistakes out loud.... Today my palms were sweating and I was chewing my lip through the entire class. My emotional state wasn't helped any by the blond girl who sat next to me. She had already taken French 3 and was just looking for a three-unit course. She made several comments about how slow the class is, and then decided this isn't the right class for her. I offered to buy her grammar book and I'm relieved that she agreed to sell it to me: that means she won't be back (p. 59).

Fortunately for Bailey, the experienced student left the class; unfortunately for most beginners in elementary foreign language classes, most false beginners remain.

The Identifying Study

The identifying study (Loughrin-Sacco, Bommarito & Sweet, 1988) consisted of a year-long ethnography of an elementary French class during the 1986-87 academic year. Although the goal of the study was quite broad (to gain insights into how students at Michigan Tech learned French in an academic setting), the integration of beginners and false beginners quickly became a central focus of study that permeated all aspects of teaching and learning behavior. The tools to conduct the study consisted of the classic triad of ethnographic data-collection measures: (1) daily classroom observations, (2) interviews with course participants, and (3) the collection of all student work, teacher course records, and other relevant documentation. The research team consisted of five un-

dergraduates, the senior faculty researcher, and two French faculty members. All underwent extensive training in data collection and analysis. The research team observed the class for 130 days and conducted over 300 hours of one-to-one interviews with class participants. The informants represented a wide sample of students: male and female, beginners and false beginners, successful and less successful. In the study, students with two or more years of prior French study were designated as false beginners; all other students were designated as beginners.

As noted above, the integration of beginners and false beginners affected all aspects of learning and teaching behavior. In the affective domain, integration contributed to beginners' feelings of low esteem, inferiority, and inadequacy, and to false beginners' apathy and boredom. Socially, the presence of false beginners influenced beginners' seating and class participation behavior, and contributed to ill-feelings and resentment toward false beginners and the teacher. In the cognitive domain, integration led to a polarization in oral and written performance, confirming the findings of Hagiwara (1983) and Halff and Frisbie (1977). Pedagogically, the integrated class created a dilemma for the instructor in terms of audience, participation patterns, grading policy, and pace of the class.

From the very beginning of the course, beginners exhibited feelings of inferiority, low esteem, inadequacy, and anxiety similar to those expressed earlier by Bailey. These feelings surfaced during individual participant interviews. Beginners related their negative feelings throughout the academic year because they were intimidated by what they perceived were fluent oral skills of false beginners. "When they (false beginners) speak, they flow," related one beginner. Because the class focused on oral communication, beginners continually heard what they perceived were fluent utterances from false beginners. For example, on the first day of class, the instructor taught introductions and greetings. False beginners eagerly responded to the instructor correctly and swiftly, eliciting this comment from Julie, a beginner:

> This guy, who was really experienced I guess, from what he told me afterwards, he just said a whole thing fast and really perfect, really good and then he (the teacher) called on me and I—I shouldn't feel like that, but I did because I just, after hearing that guy, I just blundered [*sic*].

Even some false beginners felt sympathetic toward beginners and their attempt to speak French. Tom, a false beginner, related:

> I can really feel for the beginning students who are watching all of these advanced students speaking....They can't believe what they're hearing. And they're supposed to go and do the same thing, and they can't do that.

The intimidation factor is evidenced by seating and class participation patterns. Seating patterns noted in class observation showed that students tended to work with students of equal experience and ability in small-group work. During the Fall and Spring Quarters, when the class was arranged in a horseshoe pattern, beginners sat on one side of the room while false beginners sat together on the other side of the room. The researchers observed that beginners, who felt more comfortable working with each other, spoke a lot less French than false beginners.

In addition, beginners contributed much less input during class participation. Class observation notes pointed out that false beginners dominated class participation, volunteering or being called upon, over 70% of the time. The observations also showed that beginners often reduced their participation obligations by avoiding eye contact with the instructor. When questioned why they were reluctant to participate, beginners consistently remarked that they did not know the answer, were embarrassed to take so long presenting an answer, and were afraid of making mistakes or of looking and sounding "stupid" in front of false beginners. Some admitted not understanding the questions that the instructor asked. The instructor admitted relying more on false beginners because they ensured the smooth flow of class drill and exercises and lessened periods of dead silence.

Many beginners also expressed resentment that false beginners did not enroll in a higher-level French class. There was a consensus among both groups that the course was designed for the student with prior French study despite the official course catalogue description to the contrary. Louise's comment was representative of many beginners:

> I feel like it's going too fast, for one [thing], and for another that they don't really want to be teaching students who didn't have the language before. They want to teach those who know the language how to use it better!

Jessica, a beginner, called for segregating the two groups:

> I still feel the experienced people know better than me. We should divide into a class of experienced students and a class with no experience. It would make me feel better, and the other students too.

The grade distribution and performance data for the 1986-87 academic year, which are consistent with those found by Hagiwara (1983) and Halff and Frisbie (1977), revealed why beginners felt inferior and inadequate. Tables 1 and 2 show that false beginners attained a much higher percentage of "A's" and "B's" than beginners. Eighty-four percent of false beginners received the grade of "A" or "B," compared with 54% of beginners. Forty-five percent of beginners received a "C" or "D," compared with only 13% of false beginners. Performance data in Table 3 reveal that beginners averaged a "D" or "D+" on quizzes and tests, compared with an average of "B" for false beginners. Two reasons explain why more beginners did not receive below-average grades: they performed well above average on daily creative writing activities and they were allowed to retake tests.

Table 2
Grade Distribution of Beginners and False Beginners for the 1986-87 Academic Year

	A	B	C	D	F
False beginners	40 (56%)	19 (28%)	9 (13%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)
Beginners	10 (19%)	19 (35%)	22 (41%)	2 (4%)	1 (2%)

Table 3
Performance Data on Quizzes, Tests, and Creative Writing Assignments in Mean Percentage and Grade for Winter Quarter 1986-87

	Quizzes (100 pts)	Tests (200 pts)	Final Exam (125 pts)	Writing (600 pts)
False beginners	79.3 C+	89.3 B+	87.6 B	87.9 B
Beginners	67.3 D	68.9 D+	69.9 D+	87.3 B

The grade distribution and performance data do not reveal the inequity of study time put in by beginners. When asked how many hours a week he spent studying French, John reported: "a good 10 to 12 hours a week, on just going over the new material and then I spent

another six hours, ya know going [*sic*], if there's a quiz or something like that...." Many beginners complained that they spent more time on French than on their engineering courses in their major. False beginners, on the other hand, bragged about being able to get an "A" on a test or quiz with little effort. Eric, a false beginner, seconded the discrepancy of study time expended by beginners and false beginners:

> It's not equal. I had a little more experience.... I was a little more comfortable with it and I didn't have to spend as much time as the person who just walked into it for the first time. It almost seems like an unfair advantage.

For the students who entered the elementary French class with significant previous experience in French, the mixture of levels did no apparent harm, though doubtless they could have made more progress in a class designed for them. They were called upon to provide models for the rest of the class in drills and other activities. Some false beginners exerted extra effort to enhance their language skills; others sat back and worked only when necessary. Nearly all succeeded in using the elementary French class to raise their grade point average.

For the instructor, the integrated class posed a variety of frustrating problems. He made a purposeful effort to teach the class for true beginners, even though they felt that the class was geared toward false beginners. He lowered the ratio of one chapter every six days to a chapter every ten days, used false beginners as models in difficult activities, called on beginners only when they seemed ready, and provided review sessions, extra credit, and quiz retaking opportunities to beginners who performed poorly. At the same time, the instructor challenged interested false beginners to expand their skills with intermediate-level activities. Despite his efforts to help beginners, only *one* enrolled in second-year French.

The identifying study pinpointed learner anxiety as a major impediment to beginners' progress in language learning. This finding led the author to pursue the study of learner anxiety and the variety of factors that increase or decrease its impact. This decision led to the main study which focused exclusively on foreign language classroom anxiety and its numerous anxiety-causing variables.

The Main Study

The primary objectives of the main study (Loughrin-Sacco, McCarthy, Pellar-Kosbar & Sweet, in preparation) were (1) to quantify similarities and differences in foreign language classroom anxiety between beginners and false beginners, and (2) to describe, from the students' per-

spectives, the conditions and circumstances under which anxiety occurs. The subjects consisted of 19 beginners and 44 false beginners from three elementary French classes at Michigan Tech during Winter Quarter 1990.

Procedures

To assess foreign language classroom anxiety, the researchers used a hybrid quantitative-qualitative approach. The quantitative dimension consisted of Horwitz's Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (Horwitz, Horwitz & Cope, 1986). The researchers chose the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) for two reasons: (1) the FLCAS is a comprehensive measure of foreign language classroom anxiety addressing students' self-perception in regard to speaking, listening comprehension, errors, teacher error correction, and testing; and (2) the FLCAS provides a quantifiable measuring stick for comparing beginners and false beginners. The FLCAS was distributed to all 63 elementary French students during the fifth week of Winter Quarter. The researchers waited until the fifth week of Winter Quarter, the midpoint of the academic year, to ensure that students had enough time to formulate representative opinions and feelings about the class. Afterwards, the research team ran a one-way analysis of variance on each of the 33 items on the FLCAS and prepared interview questions based on the results. The Appendix gives each item, the number of beginners and false beginners, their mean scores, standard deviations, and levels of significance.

The qualitative dimension consisted of follow-up, one-to-one interviews conducted by the four-member research team. A total of ten students, four beginners and six false beginners, were interviewed a week to two weeks after completing the FLCAS. The one-to-one interviews examined student responses to the FLCAS and enabled them to elaborate on their selection process. For example, for item 9 ("I start to panic when I have to speak without preparation in language class."), the student would explain why he or she chose one of the five possible responses. Follow-up questions for item 9 probed for supplemental information: "Do you experience anxiety when you are prepared?" "What does it mean to you to be prepared?" "How much time do you spend on class preparations?" "What types of activities do you do to get prepared for French?" "What percentage of the time do you feel prepared for French?" Other questions were unstructured depending on the nature of the student's original response to an item. Upon completion of the interviews, the researchers categorized the data according to the themes contained within the FLCAS. These include speaking anxiety,

listening comprehension, pace of the class, class participation, student errors, error correction, testing, and self-perception. Each member of the research team individually examined the interview data and developed generalizations based on the representativeness of interview responses. The team met to compare generalizations and reached a consensus after discussion and a close verification of the data.

Results

Overall, a one-way analysis of variance revealed significant differences in responses between beginners and false beginners on over half of the items (17 out of 33). To verify that the differences were attributed to beginners and false beginners alone, the researchers statistically analyzed the effects of major (B.A. vs. B.S. students), sex, year in school, and teacher, and found no significant differences.

Feelings about speaking French in class were identified by six items (1, 9, 14, 18, 23, and 24). Significant differences between beginners and false beginners existed on four of the six items, measured on a scale of +2 (strongly agree) to -2 (strongly disagree). On item 1, both groups never felt quite sure of themselves when speaking French, though beginners (.789) marked "agree" significantly more often than false beginners (.159). On item 9, beginners indicated that they "agreed" that they were more prone to panic (.737) than false beginners (-.023) when they had to speak French without preparation. For item 14, both groups admitted that they would be nervous speaking French with native speakers. On item 18, beginners (-.684) admitted their lack of confidence in speaking French; false beginners, despite their years of prior French study, chose the response "unsure" (.000). On item 23, beginners (.474) felt that other students spoke French better than they did; false beginners (-.432) professed their superiority in speaking French by marking "disagree." Concerning speaking French in front of other students (item 24), there was no significant difference in response; both groups admitted feeling self-conscious.

The FLCAS included only two items (4 and 29) on the relationship between listening comprehension and anxiety. The researchers probed deeper into the relationship by asking each student how much French was spoken in class and how much he or she understood. In this study, as in the identifying study, students reported that instructors spoke French approximately 75%-90% of class time. The follow-up questions revealed a large, self-reported discrepancy in listening comprehension. False beginners reported that they understood approximately 90% of teacher discourse in French; beginners 10%-30%. One beginner's comment is representative of the four beginners interviewed:

> I'm in a complete cloud; it seems like they (false beginners) understand so much more than I do. I don't usually understand even what the questions are asking.... Most of the time I have to ask my neighbor what she (the teacher) said. I feel lost.

Item 4 from the FLCAS corroborates the anxiety expressed by beginners in the interviews. Beginners responded that they "agreed" that they were frightened when they didn't understand what the teacher was saying (.368); false beginners were unfazed (-.409). Item 29, which differs slightly in wording from item 4, states: "I get nervous when I don't understand every word the language teacher says." Although their responses were not significantly different, beginners were "unsure" (.000) while false beginners "disagreed" (-.477).

The willingness to participate in class is the hub around which emanate students' perceptions about speaking, listening comprehension, pace of the class, making mistakes, error correction, as well as their self-perception. Class participation was also the theme that both beginners and false beginners discussed most during interviews. Of the eight items that pinpoint some aspect of class participation (2, 3, 12, 13, 19, 20, 31, and 33), three revealed significant differences in responses between beginners and false beginners, two nearly approached significance, and three were insignificant.

The examination of class participation begins with the emotions that students feel when they are called on to participate in class. Neither group seemed to feel strong physical aversion to class participation. On item 3, both groups responded that they "disagreed" that they trembled when they were going to be called on, though false beginners (-.705) "disagreed" significantly more often than beginners (-.053). On item 20, which involved heart pounding when called on, again both groups responded that they "disagreed" with the statement, though the gap in response narrowed. The difference in responses between the two groups was not significant, although false beginners were further removed from the emotion of heart pounding (-.5) than beginners (-.158).

Items 12, 13, and 33 indicated that moderate levels of anxiety existed for beginners. For item 12 ("In language class, I can get so nervous I forget things I know."), beginners tended to "agree" (.368) while false beginners tended to "disagree" (-.295). Although this spread in responses seems diverse, the differences were not significant. On item 13, beginners were significantly closer to being embarrassed when volunteering answers in class (.000) than false beginners (-.841). Interview data support this contention. False beginners reported that they volunteered between 65%-80% of the times they participated in class, versus only 10%-15% for beginners. For item 33, even though there were no significant differences

in responses, false beginners (.000) and beginners (.526) tended to "agree" with the statement that they were nervous when the teacher asked questions they had not prepared in advance.

Items 2, 19, and 31 sought to identify the causes for anxiety in class participation. Only item 2 had a significant difference. It revealed that both groups were concerned about making mistakes in language class, although beginners (-.632) were significantly more concerned than false beginners (.045). Item 19 indicated that both groups, who answered almost identically (-.842 for beginners and -.841 for false beginners), "disagreed" with the statement that they were afraid their teacher was ready to correct every mistake they made. Item 31 revealed that students were sympathetic to one another when they spoke French. Both groups "disagreed" with the statement that they were afraid the other students would laugh at them when they spoke French.

Items 16, 25, and 30 pinpoint another area that may be linked to class participation: the students' perception of the pace of the class. All three items showed significant differences in responses between beginners and false beginners, reinforcing the findings in the identifying study. On item 25, beginners "agreed" (.368) that language class moved so quickly they worried about getting left behind. False beginners "disagreed" with the statement (-.316). For item 30, beginners responded that they "agreed" that they felt overwhelmed by the number of rules they had to learn to speak a foreign language (.263); false beginners "disagreed" (-.455). In item 16 beginners felt anxious about class even though they were well prepared. Beginners marked "agree" with item 16 (.211), while false beginners "disagreed" (.636).

Interview data support the students' responses for class pace. Mary Anne, a beginner, summed up the concern for all beginners: "She (the teacher) expects us to master in ten weeks what these guys (false beginners) have had years to learn." For many false beginners the pace of the class was acceptable or even too slow: "I didn't do anything in class. It was a refresher course." "I've been studying French for five years and feel like some of it (the class) is going too slow." "Most of this is still kind of a review, so I know how to do it even without preparing for class."

To complete the analysis of data from Horwitz's FLCAS, below are items on general anxiety. All five items involve students' perception about the French class or about themselves. Of the five items, three (26, 10, 28) revealed significant differences in responses between beginners and false beginners; two were not significant. Item 26 asked students to compare their anxiety in French with their anxiety in other classes. Beginners "agreed" (.211) that they were more nervous and tense in

French class; false beginners "disagreed" (-.884). On item 10, they "agreed" (.105) they worried about the consequences of failing the course; false beginners "disagreed" (-.932) with the statement. Item 28 extends the two previous items a step further. Beginners "disagreed" (-.105) that they felt very sure and relaxed on their way to French class; false beginners "agreed" (.636). Despite the anxiety reported by beginners, both groups "agreed" with item 5 (.684 for beginners; .864 for false beginners) that they would take more French. On item 17, both groups "disagreed" with the statement: "I often feel like not going to my language class."

Discussion

What were the effects of integrating beginners and false beginners in elementary French classes at Michigan Tech? Results from both the identifying study and the main study are consistent in describing two polarized groups, vastly different in their amount of language learning experience, levels of anxiety, language skill, and grade distribution. Results from both studies also point to the difficulty for the instructors both to meet the needs of beginners and to challenge false beginners. These findings were derived from intensive ethnographic scrutiny (classroom observations, one-to-one interviews, collection of class artifacts) in the identifying study and, in the main study, from data using Horwitz's Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale and subsequent interviews with selected scale participants. Coincidentally, in both studies, 56% of the participants consisted of students who had already completed two or more years of high school French; true beginners, for whom the elementary French classes were theoretically intended, made up 44%.

It appeared that integrated elementary French classes contributed heavily to beginners' low self-esteem and to feelings of inferiority, inadequacy, and anxiety. From the beginning of each school year, beginners were unable to focus exclusively on the task of learning French, worrying instead about competing with false beginners. Despite the lack of a grading curve and the instructor's assurances to the contrary, beginners saw themselves competing directly with false beginners on exams. Beginners saw no way they could match the oral skills or the learning pace of false beginners. They complained of having a tenuous grasp of the material because of the pace of the class (item 25). Item 30 revealed that they were overloaded by the number of rules they had to learn to speak French. Interview data pointed out that they often had difficulty understanding their teacher when he or she spoke French. Beginners consistently blamed themselves for their lack of success or for the amount of time needed to be successful. In the main study, beginners

even questioned their own foreign language aptitude, attributing false beginners' success to aptitude rather than to prior experience. For example, on items 7 and 23 of Horwitz's FLCAS, beginners felt that the other students were better at learning languages; not unexpectedly, they also felt that the other students spoke French better than they.

The feelings of inferiority and inadequacy may have negatively affected their class behavior. Beginners were reluctant to volunteer answers in class. FLCAS data showed that they were concerned with making mistakes (item 2) and that they were self-conscious about speaking French in front of other students (item 24). Beginners even reported that they could get so nervous they forgot things they knew (item 12).

False beginners, on the other hand, experienced relatively little anxiety. "Relaxed" and "comfortable" are two adjectives that best describe false beginners in both studies. They had little trouble understanding their teacher's French (item 4), felt at ease during tests (item 8), didn't panic when asked to speak French without preparation (item 9), were willing to volunteer answers (item 13), felt superior to the other students in speaking French (item 23), and felt sure and relaxed on their way to French class (item 28). The only clear-cut type of anxiety involved speaking. They admitted never quite feeling sure of themselves when speaking French in class (items 1 and 18), being nervous speaking French with native speakers (item 14), and worrying about making mistakes (item 2).

The portraits of beginners and false beginners clearly demonstrate the dilemma faced by the three instructors. While working at a pace slower than that recommended by the textbook authors, the instructors proceeded, nevertheless, at a pace too slow for one group and too rapid for the other. In trying to speak French as much as possible in class, the instructors encountered one group that understood them well and another that groped just to understand simple questions or directions. In trying to promote the development of oral skills, they found one group performing well on interviews, skits, and other oral activities, and another group struggling to put together a coherent sentence. During their struggle to help beginners, however, the instructors found language activities in which beginners were successful: reading comprehension, creative writing exercises, and contextual listening comprehension activities such as anecdotes. These "success stories" suggest how elementary language courses for true beginners might be organized.

Curricular Alternatives to Integrated Classes

Integrated classes exist in many American postsecondary institutions for numerous reasons: (1) placing both groups together ensures scheduling convenience; (2) many departments show an indifference toward el-

ementary language study, preferring to allot their monetary and professional resources in other curricular areas within the department; (3) many administrators and faculty are unaware of the problems that exist in integrated classes; and (4) many departments do not offer advanced placement credit and other incentives to convince false beginners to enroll in intermediate or advanced language courses. Klee and Rodgers (1989) cited three other factors: many false beginners are placed into elementary classes because of inadequate preparation at the high school level; language loss by false beginners forces them to return to elementary language courses, and limited course options exist for false beginners.

Integrated foreign language courses undercut the profession's efforts to produce proficient speakers of other languages. For many false beginners, retaking elementary foreign language is analogous to a high school student repeating first grade. It is wasteful and counterproductive because students could be building upon their language skills in an intermediate or advanced course. Integrated classes for beginners are counterproductive because the presence of false beginners raises their affective filter to a level that seriously impedes learning. By promoting or tolerating integrated elementary classes, institutions are sending the underlying message to beginners: "Take a foreign language class at your own risk."

I would like to propose curricular alternatives and incentives to eliminate integrated elementary foreign language courses. First, postsecondary institutions and their foreign language departments must provide advanced placement credit to students to entice potential false beginners to bypass elementary courses. Typically, students with prior foreign language study receive no advanced placement credit regardless of the level of foreign language in which they enroll. As a consequence, false beginners, unless they plan to pursue a major or a minor in a foreign language, purposely fail a placement test in order to enroll in elementary classes.

At Michigan Tech, students with prior foreign language study can receive a years' worth (12 quarter hours) or two years' worth (21 hours) of credits if they receive a "C" or better in a qualifying course. For example, if a student receives a 450 or better on the ETS Advanced Placement Exam, they will receive 12 hours of elementary foreign language if they receive a "C" or better in an intermediate-level course. The "carrot and stick" approach not only enables students (and parents) to save hundreds of dollars in tuition, and helps students graduate earlier, it significantly increases enrollments in intermediate and advanced language courses. One direct benefit of advanced placement

credit is the increase in literature and applied language offerings. Michigan Tech, which has no major in foreign language or a foreign language requirement, offers five literature courses, two courses in business language, and one in scientific and technical language.

Three additional incentives exist for potential false beginners to bypass elementary courses at Michigan Tech: a student who enrolls in an intermediate language course is only five courses away from receiving the institution's 30-hour Certificate in Foreign Language and Area Study. The Certificate, which combines course work in foreign language, social sciences, and business, constitutes the rough equivalent of an international studies minor. Since its inception in 1984, over 200 students have received this certificate. The attractiveness of a minor should entice students at other institutions.

The second incentive involves Michigan Tech's Thematic Cluster requirement, which is designed to make students more academically well-rounded. Students are required to take three courses at the 300 or 400 level in a field unrelated to their major. For scientists and engineers, foreign language and international studies is an attractive option that fulfills the Thematic Cluster requirement. The third incentive involves increasing extrinsic motivation for foreign language study. Michigan Tech, through a $59,795 Title VI grant from the U.S. Department of Education is setting up paid international internships for students with three years of college foreign language study. These internships, coupled with increased employment opportunities for engineers and businesspeople with foreign language and intercultural expertise, are making foreign language study at Michigan Tech more appealing than five years ago. These three incentives have succeeded, by and large, in attracting potential false beginners into appropriate higher-level courses.

Despite incentives, many experienced students still enroll in elementary classes. Preoccupation with one's grade point average deters many from risking potential low grades in intermediate or advanced foreign language classes. By "playing it safe" in an elementary course, experienced students stand a better chance of receiving a GPA-enhancing grade. Other false beginners, however, have legitimately experienced language loss. Hagiwara (1983) reported that 91% of the students with two years of high school French at the University of Michigan had at least two intervening years of no foreign language study. Many Michigan Tech students, who recommence foreign language study their junior or senior year, have had four or five years of foreign language inactivity. Hagiwara also pointed out that the longer the period of language inactivity, the lower the placement. In examining students with two years of high school French, he found that 24% of students with one or

one-and-a-half intervening years placed into first-semester French, compared with 37% of students with three or three-and-a-half intervening years. His findings point to the need for refresher courses for experienced language students.

Klee and Rodgers (1989) reported, however, that few course options existed for students with high school foreign language experience. Only 17 of 58 institutions offered a one-term review course, eight offered an intensive review course, but only two of 58 institutions offered both types of review courses. Both review courses were offered fall quarter. If all institutions offered review courses, the number of false beginners in elementary classes would be greatly reduced.

Another course possibility to revive language skills is a summer refresher course similar to Michigan Tech's for experienced foreign language students (see Loughrin-Sacco, Matthews, Sweet & Miner, 1990, for a course description). MTU's summer intensive course is a two-week, six-hour-a-day program of study that is offered two weeks before the beginning of fall quarter. (Michigan Tech offers the refresher course in the summer so that experienced language students can move immediately into intermediate or advanced language courses during fall quarter). After taking an advanced placement exam to assess their language knowledge and skills, students undergo an intensive review of grammar and vocabulary in addition to immersion-type activities in the foreign language. Students are assisted through the language-revival process by an instructor, volunteer advanced-level student assistants, and native speakers from the community. On the last day of the course, students take another advanced placement exam. Pre-test/post-test data from two French courses and one Spanish course showed an 11% increase in placement exam scores; over 90% of the participants placed into either intermediate or advanced language courses.

If the "carrot" approach fails to keep false beginners out of elementary French, German, and Spanish courses, strict course requirements prevent course repeats. Students in the College of Liberal Arts at the University of Minnesota cannot receive graduation credit for first-year French, German, or Spanish courses unless they have already satisfied the entrance standard in another foreign language. This rule reduces the number of false beginners who retake elementary French, German, and Spanish courses. (See Barnes, Klee & Wakefield in this volume.)

Future Research

This essay has examined the nature of integrated elementary French classes based on two studies at Michigan Tech. Additional research is needed at other types of institutions in all three major languages to

broaden the findings of this preliminary research. The parameters of future research in this area are twofold. First, the profession needs more studies of integrated elementary language classes and the multiplicity of variables that affect language learning. Second, the profession needs more studies of segregated classes that serve only beginners or students with high school foreign language. The twofold approach would provide language coordinators and researchers a more complete understanding of language learning in these two contexts, provide concrete empirical evidence to make informed decisions, and enhance productivity in elementary language instruction. Below are my recommendations for specific studies:

1) At a preliminary stage, language coordinators should invite beginners and false beginners to talk about their language learning experiences at different times of the academic year to determine if problems exist, and if so, elucidate where problem areas lie.

2) To determine whether the findings of the Michigan Tech studies are generalizable to other institutions, I recommend conducting additional classroom anxiety studies at several institutions of different sizes and from different regions. These studies, which should also study German and Spanish students, could use Horwitz's FLCAS, interview data, classroom observations, or any combination of the three data collection types. Afterwards, these studies should be extended to study anxiety levels of students in intermediate and advanced language classes. If there are enough former beginners in language classes at these two levels, these studies would determine at what stage students with no high school language experience reduce their anxiety levels to match students with high school language experience. Institutions that participated in Klee and Rodgers' 1989 national survey on articulation might be likely candidates to participate in this type of study.

3) To proceed beyond self-reported accounts of learners' skills, language coordinators and researchers should statistically compare the reading, listening, speaking, and writing skills of beginners and false beginners during different stages in the elementary class. These studies would determine the skill levels of both groups, how these skills develop, whether false beginners are superior in all four skills, and, if so, how long they retain their superiority. If the skill levels of the two groups are not equivalent at the end of the elementary sequence, these types of studies should be extended to the intermediate and advanced levels, if enough beginners continue at these levels. These studies would determine at what stage, if any, former beginners have skills equal to those of students with high school language experience.

4) Classroom anxiety studies need to be conducted in elementary classes with all true beginners. The Michigan Tech main study cannot ascertain what part of the anxiety felt by beginners was attributable to the presence of false beginners and what part was caused by the process of language learning itself.

5) Studies are needed to determine which methods, materials, and techniques are most effective in elementary classes for true beginners or in review classes for experienced language students. The Michigan Tech studies suggested that a four-skills approach using a grammar-based syllabus from a top-selling textbook may not have been appropriate for students with no prior language experience. Such studies would determine if one particular approach, types of materials, or techniques facilitate language learning for beginners. All elementary foreign language textbooks, for example, are currently written for one amorphous audience, making no distinction for integrated language classes with two audiences.

Finally, I urge the formation of conference panels sponsored by AAUSC to further discuss issues in elementary language learning involving beginners and false beginners.

Conclusion

The harmful effects of integration have been demonstrated through two studies conducted four years apart. The consistency of student responses is evidenced by over 315 hours of interview testimony, classroom observations, and survey data from Horwitz's FLCAS. The survey data showed a significant difference in responses between beginners and false beginners on 17 of the 33 items. Furthermore, in distributing the FLCAS to 71 beginning German students, my colleagues and I found significant differences between beginners and false beginners on 15 of 33 items. The data on Michigan Tech German students implies that integrating beginners and false beginners is not limited to French.

The most damaging impact of integration at Michigan Tech was felt in upper-level French enrollments. Beginners comprised 44% of the students in the elementary French classes in the first study. In the 1987-88 academic year, one year after the first study, *only one beginner* enrolled in second-year French. That sole beginner did not continue beyond that level. Upper-level enrollments in the 1989-90 academic year show a more positive trend, though the enrollment decline of beginners is still troubling: beginners comprised 44% of the elementary French class, 22% of the two intermediate classes, and 17% of the two advanced classes. An additional disturbing factor emanates from the 1989-90 enrollments: overall enrollments at the elementary level have declined, despite in-

creased enrollments at the intermediate and advanced levels. I propose two possible hypotheses for the decline: (1) students with no prior French study may be reluctant to take French because they have heard from previous beginners that they will have to compete with false beginners and spend an inordinate amount of time and effort in order to succeed in the class; (2) on a more positive note, the shifting enrollment patterns away from the elementary level may point to the success of incentives in attracting false beginners into higher-level courses. Given the nation's need for foreign language expertise, foreign language departments cannot afford to discard a large percentage of their students because they neglected to take high school foreign language. Nor can they tolerate the inefficient practice of allowing false beginners to retake elementary foreign language courses. Rather, language coordinators and researchers must pursue ways of maximizing productivity in elementary foreign language instruction. Segregating students by level of experience is a major step toward that end.

Works Cited

Aleamoni, Lawrence M. & Richard E. Spencer. "Development of the University of Illinois Foreign Language Placement and Proficiency System and Its Results for Fall 1966 and 1967." *Modern Language Journal* 52 (1968): 335-59.

Bailey, Kathleen M. "An Introspective Analysis of an Individual's Language Learning Experience." *Research in Second Language Acquisition: Selected Papers of the Los Angeles Second Language Research Forum*. Ed. R. C. Scarcella & S. D. Krashen. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1980: 58-65.

Hagiwara, Peter. "Student Placement in French: Results and Implications." *Modern Language Journal* 67(1983): 12-19.

Halff, Nancy F. & David A. Frisbie. "College Foreign Language Study Related to High School Foreign Language Study." *Modern Language Journal* 61 (1977): 401-6.

Horwitz, Elaine K., Michael B. Horwitz & Joann Cope. "Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety." *Modern Language Journal* 70 (1986): 125-32.

Klee, Carol A. & Elizabeth S. Rodgers. "Status of Articulation: Placement, Advanced Placement Credit, and Course Options." *Hispania* 72 (1989): 763-73.

Loughrin-Sacco, Steven J., Ellen M. Bommarito & Wendy M. Sweet. "Anatomy of an Elementary French Class." Paper presented at the Symposium on Research Perspectives in Adult Language Learning & Acquisition, Ohio State University, Columbus, October 1988.

_____, Sylvia Matthews, Wendy M. Sweet & Jan A. Miner. "Reviving Language Skills: A Description and Evaluation of Michigan Tech's Summer Intensive French Course." *ADFL Bulletin* 21, ii (1990): 34-40.

_____, Chris McCarthy, Christine Pellar-Kosbar & Wendy M. Sweet. "A Hybrid Quantitative-Qualitative Approach to the Study of Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety," in preparation.

Spencer, Richard E. & Ronald L. Flaugher. "A Study of an Assumption about High School and College Equivalency in Language Teaching." *Modern Language Journal* 51 (1967): 331-35.

Appendix

Mean FLCAS Scores of 19 Beginners and 44 False Beginners.

Strongly agree = 2, agree = 1, neutral = 0, disagree = -1, strongly disagree = -2

Group:	*Mean*	*S.D.*	
1. I never feel quite sure of myself when I am speaking in my foreign language class.			
Beginners	.789	.787	
False Beginners	.159	.987	*p = .0166
2. I don't worry about making mistakes in language class.			
Beginners	-.632	.831	
False Beginners	-.045	1.160	*p = .05
3. I tremble when I know I'm going to be called on in language class.			
Beginners	-.053	1.224	
False Beginners	-.705	1.091	*p= .04
4. It frightens me when I don't understand what the teacher is saying in language class.			
Beginners	.368	1.012	
False Beginners	-.409	1.217	*p= .0195
5. It wouldn't bother me at all to take more foreign language classes.			
Beginners	.684	1.108	
False Beginners	.864	1.193	not significant
6. During language class, I find myself thinking about other things that have nothing to do with the course.			
Beginners	-.526	1.073	
False Beginners	-.205	1.153	not significant
7. I keep thinking that the other students are better at languages than I am.			
Beginners	.526	1.172	
False Beginners	-.318	1.196	*p= .0121

Group:	*Mean*	*S.D.*	
8. I am usually at ease during tests in my language class.			
Beginners	.000	1.000	
False Beginners	.795	1.153	*p= .0114
9. I start to panic when I have to speak without preparation in language class.			
Beginners	.737	1.147	
False Beginners	-.023	1.131	*p= .0178
10. I worry about the consequences of failing my foreign language class.			
Beginners	.105	1.410	
False Beginners	-.932	1.300	*p= .0063
11. I don't understand why people get so upset over foreign language class.			
Beginners	-.105	.875	
False Beginners	.364	1.014	not significant
12. In language class, I can get so nervous I forget things I know.			
Beginners	.368	1.300	
False Beginners	-.295	1.250	not significant
13. It embarrasses me to volunteer answers in my language class.			
Beginners	.000	1.054	
False Beginners	-.841	1.098	*p= .0064
14. I would not be nervous speaking the foreign language with native speakers.			
Beginners	-.737	1.327	
False Beginners	-.477	1.191	not significant
15. I get upset when I don't understand what the teacher is correcting.			
Beginners	-.368	1.116	
False Beginners	-.341	1.033	not significant
16. Even if I am well prepared for language class, I feel anxious about it.			
Beginners	.211	.787	
False Beginners	-.636	1.141	*p= .0053
17. I often feel like not going to my language class.			
Beginners	-.895	.875	
False Beginners	-.659	1.275	not significant

Group:	*Mean*	*S.D.*	
18. I feel confident when I speak in foreign language class.			
Beginners	-.684	.749	
False Beginners	.000	.964	*p= .0078
19. I am afraid that my language teacher is ready to correct every mistake I make.			
Beginners	-.842	.898	
False Beginners	-.841	1.098	not significant
20. I can feel my heart pounding when I'm going to be called on in my language class.			
Beginners	-.158	1.068	
False Beginners	-.500	1.191	not significant
21. The more I study for a language test, the more I get confused.			
Beginners	-.789	1.084	
False Beginners	- 1.341	1.140	not significant
22. I don't feel pressure to prepare very well for language class.			
Beginners	-.053	.911	
False Beginners	-.182	1.105	not significant
23. I always feel that the other students speak the foreign language better than I do.			
Beginners	.474	1.073	
False Beginners	-.432	1.208	*p= .0065
24. I feel very self-conscious about speaking the foreign language in front of other students.			
Beginners	.526	.841	
False Beginners	.116	1.096	not significant
25. Language class moves so quickly I worry about getting left behind.			
Beginners	.368	1.116	
False Beginners	-.318	1.216	*p= .0392
26. I feel more tense and nervous in my language class than in my other classes.			
Beginners	.211	1.316	
False Beginners	-.884	1.258	*p= .0028

Group:	*Mean*	*S.D.*	
27. I get nervous and confused when I am speaking in my language class.			
Beginners	.368	1.300	
False Beginners	-.455	1.210	*p= .0183
28. When I'm on my way to language class, I feel very sure and relaxed.			
Beginners	-.105	.809	
False Beginners	.636	1.036	*p= .0074
29. I get nervous when I don't understand every word the language teacher says.			
Beginners	.000	1.054	
False Beginners	-.477	1.191	not significant
30. I feel overwhelmed by the number of rules you have to learn to speak the foreign language.			
Beginners	.263	1.098	
False Beginners	-.455	1.109	*p= .0213
31. I am afraid that the other students will laugh at me when I speak the foreign language.			
Beginners	-.684	.671	
False Beginners	-1.000	.915	not significant
32. I would probably feel comfortable around native speakers of the foreign language.			
Beginners	-.632	.684	
False Beginners	-.295	1.047	not significant
33. I get nervous when the language teacher asks questions which I haven't prepared in advanced.			
Beginners	.526	.841	
False Beginners	.000	1.034	not significant

The Question of Language Program Direction Is *Academic*

James F. Lee and Bill VanPatten
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

In recent years efforts have been made to enhance the professional status of the language program director. Lee (1987) offered a framework for professionalizing the position of language program director. Teschner (1987) surveyed language program directors across the country to determine in what fields they wrote their dissertations and on what topics they publish and present papers. He found that while the minority of program directors wrote dissertations in the area of applied language studies, higher percentages write articles and speak on topics related to language teaching. Sadow (1989) provided an explanatory description of what foreign language methodologists do that is of a scholarly nature. The work of language program directors, however, has not always been esteemed and is often misunderstood.

In a recent conversation with someone at a conference, we were asked if we knew anyone looking for a job as language program director. We asked what his institution wanted the language program director to do. He answered, "Teach language courses and supervise teaching assistants (TAs)." We asked, "And what else?" He responded, "Do research in the language program." We asked again, "And what else?" With a puzzled expression on his face and an uncomprehending nod of his head he repeated, "Teach language courses and supervise TAs."

In 1986, Dvorak described the basic language program (i.e., the first two years of language instruction) in a large research institution as an

ivory ghetto, "a small preserve within which the directors spend almost all their time, but which their colleagues enter only on occasion, and then with condescension rather than admiration or enthusiasm" (p. 221). In this ivory ghetto the language program director administers the language program, supervises TAs, and teaches mainly, if not exclusively, basic language courses. Given the workload of program direction and the perception that the primary teaching responsibilities of the language program director should be in the language program, opportunities to venture beyond the ghetto walls are few.

Dvorak's ivory ghetto metaphor is still a viable one for describing the work situation of many language program directors. Yet around the time Dvorak's article was published, certain positive events involving language program direction were taking place. The Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) is an organization representing Big Ten universities (Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Michigan State, Minnesota, Northwestern, Ohio State, Purdue, and Wisconsin) plus the University of Chicago and the University of Illinois at Chicago. The annual CIC meetings of romance languages originally involved only the heads and chairs of departments. However, since 1984, the persons involved in language program direction, coordination, and TA supervision were invited to meet in separate sessions to explore areas of common interest and need. Indeed, the role of personnel involved in the administration of language programs was one of the issues discussed by the heads and chairs of the research institutions. In 1985, the CIC heads and chairs issued a resolution, endorsed by the language program directors, recommending that all language program directors in CIC institutions:

1) be appointed to tenure-track positions;

2) be granted course-load reductions to compensate for the administrative part of their work;

3) have a support structure to assist in program administration in accordance with the size of the program;

4) have their work in the language program presented under the rubric of teaching for promotion and tenure decisions;

5) have their publications in such fields as pedagogy, second language acquisition, and applied linguistics recognized in promotion and tenure decisions (CIC, 1986).

In this article, the five points of the CIC resolution will be referred to from time to time, but we wish to underscore two ideas here: 1) that the language program director be appointed to a tenure-track position;

and 2) that fields representing areas of applied language studies (e.g. pedagogy, second language acquisition, and applied linguistics) be recognized as areas in which scholarly research is conducted.

To preface the positions taken in this article, we wish to state categorically that we esteem the work of language program directors. Moreover, we esteem basic language instruction and hold that it is not merely a service to the university but an integral component of the mission of postsecondary language departments.

Redefining Expectations: Against a Reduced Publication Load

The metaphor of the "revolving door position," i.e. one that experiences frequent changes in personnel, is a tired but all too accurate description of the position of language program director. Excessive workloads and sparse professional opportunities contribute to frequent changeover. Over the past five years, however, the workload demands placed on language program directors have been addressed by many institutions in a number of ways. At some institutions, academic staff (nonfaculty) are appointed as language program directors, and thereby avoid all expectations to conduct and publish research, an unfortunate situation in that the language program directors and perhaps language teaching itself, are stigmatized as less than worthy of faculty attention. At other institutions, faculty who are appointed as language program directors have been given a reduced publication load compared to other faculty. Reducing the publication load of language program directors distinguishes them from other faculty in their departments in two ways. First, only the language program director has such an arrangement; the other faculty do not. Second, the scholarly production expected of the language program director is less than that of other faculty members in the department. While a reduced publication requirement may certainly be a welcome insurance policy for a language program director, such an arrangement may create as many problems as it solves.

A reduction in expected publication may all too easily be misconstrued as indicating that the language program director is not as capable a scholar as the rest of the faculty. While the rest of the faculty can aspire to the teacher/scholar model, the language program director is categorized as a teacher/administrator. The uniqueness of a reduced publication load isolates the language program director and perhaps reinforces the idea that there is a second-class citizen in the department who teaches language (just as the TAs do) and so is not expected to have an area of scholarly expertise in which to publish the quantity that the rest of the faculty must.

While a reduced publication load recognizes the administrative demands on the language program director, it does so at the expense of the academic nature of being a faculty member, i.e. teaching and scholarship. We question why and how in academia the scholarly demands on a faculty member would be decreased, while the administrative ones would remain intact. Recognizing that the administrative demands on the language program director are excessive should lead to a *decrease in the administrative demands so that the scholarly demands on the faculty member can be met.* Simply stated, the language program director is an academic, a scholar like his or her faculty colleagues, and should be afforded the opportunity to engage in scholarly activity.

Dvorak's (1986) article offers some insight on this issue. She describes the hierarchical nature of the tasks involved in directing a language program. Her intent is to delineate those tasks that require the immediate attention of a faculty member and those that do not. In conjunction with the CIC resolution that language program directors have a support structure to assist in administration, this hierarchy offers a starting point for reformulating the administrative demands on the language program director so that the scholarly demands can be met.

Using his department as an example, Lee (1989) describes one such hierarchical arrangement of support staff in a large language program (over 1,500 undergraduate students per semester taught by some 75 graduate teaching assistants). The position, Director of Basic Language Instruction, is a tenure-track faculty line. While Lee's circumstances may not reflect the reality of all colleges and universities, they point to three principles for directing language programs and TA training:

1) The language program director must be treated by the department (and therefore must act accordingly) as a faculty member first and an administrator second.

2) The work that requires a faculty member is performed by the Director of Basic Language Instruction; all other tasks can be delegated.

3) The support staff of course supervisors (graduate students, lecturers, or junior faculty) should be capable, talented, and well-trained.

Language program direction requires knowledgeable leadership, but as a faculty activity it is not scholarly in nature, i.e. it does not entail research per se. We would like to suggest that much of the workload can be viewed as teaching-oriented and thus the CIC resolution to reduce the course-load of the language program director makes sense. Many duties of the position are directly relevant to the curriculum, for example, textbook selection and syllabus and exam design. Observing TAs and/or working at the general improvement of their classroom performance is certainly related to the teaching mission of most colleges and universities.

In another vein, the position also entails a great deal of service-oriented activities. The director may regularly staff courses, resolve problems, serve on committees that review graduate students, and serve on any number of committees associated with undergraduate instruction and graduate student training.

If we recognize the work involved in language program direction as teaching- or even service-oriented, then the number of hours of work involved must be accounted for in an equitable way. How much time is any faculty member expected to devote to teaching and service activities? Whatever the answer to that question (since it varies from institution to institution), that is the measure against which to reduce the teaching load of the language program director. The issue underscored in the CIC resolution and in this article is to establish a professional environment that fosters both sound language program direction and scholarship. If three beginning assistant professors are brought into a department, one in applied language studies, one in literature, and one in theoretical linguistics, the demands placed on them in the areas of research, service, and teaching should be comparable.

In short, reducing expectations for scholarly activity is not the tool that will break down the walls of the ivory ghetto. Rather, it is the tool that may further marginalize the language program director. A reduced research requirement makes for a self-fulfilling prophecy that faculty in applied language studies are not as scholarly as their colleagues in literary or linguistic studies, whereas the fact may be that they do not have the time to be so. Reducing the publication requirement may seal the fate of many language program directors as second-class citizens, ones who are perceived as one step above the graduate TAs in status and as an extension of the office staff. A reduced publication requirement may backfire by affirming that for a person in applied language studies, a scholarly research agenda is a secondary concern.

The Language Program Director as Researcher and Scholar

While the intention behind reducing publication requirements is admirable, it fails to acknowledge the more fundamental problem of how applied language specialists are perceived by their departmental colleagues. Sadow (1989, p. 27) discusses this issue for methodologists, i.e., those "whose primary research interest is in developing techniques and approaches that enhance language teaching... ."

Historically, a certain amount of confusion surrounds the term applied linguistics (see Magnan, 1983, for a fuller discussion). Does

applied linguistics mean applying the insights gained from the field of linguistics to language teaching? This definition encompasses one of many facets of what applied language studies can entail. Given that most language departments are literary dominant, many faculty are unaware that there are differences between a methodologist, an applied linguist, and a second language acquisitionist, who pursue fairly distinct research agenda. For example, the research conducted by a second language acquisitionist may have little, if any, direct bearing on language teaching, whereas the work of a methodologist will have a direct bearing. Many language department faculty consider the scholarly/research activity of all these specialists as synonymous with language teaching, and hence outside the realm of scholarship.

Given this lack of understanding, perhaps underlying a hesitancy or reluctance to recognize applied language studies as a viable scholarly discipline is the argument that articles on how to teach are not scholarly. Many of our literature colleagues argue that anyone who teaches can put onto paper how he or she thinks things should be done. And we would concur. One does not need a Ph.D. in applied language studies to produce a technique-based article or even an interesting and innovative textbook. There are many persons educated in literary studies and theoretical linguistics who are creative individuals who listen to and read about developments in language teaching. These individuals care deeply about teaching and do excellent work in the classroom by most standards. The professional in applied language studies must distinguish himself or herself not only as a teacher but as a researcher as well.

Our somewhat negative response to the idea of reducing the publication requirements for a language program director stems from what it means to us to have earned a Ph.D. and what it means to have chosen academia as a career. The Ph.D. is a *research* degree. It is the degree that formally and thus professionally distinguishes between those who *consume others' knowledge* and those who are capable of *producing knowledge for others to consume.* In order to earn the Ph.D. a candidate must make an *original* contribution to his or her field. It is possible to do so only if research abilities have been developed.

Unfortunately, some language department faculty vote against promotion and tenure based not on the *quality* or even *quantity* of production but solely on the *field*. These faculty refuse to acknowledge the scholarly nature of applied language studies or the place of applied language studies in a language department. Such attitudes and the ensuing problems they create (one of these being the "revolving door" tenure-track or academic staff position) prompted the CIC department heads and chairs to recommend the recognition of work in methodol-

ogy, second language acquisition, and applied linguistics for the promotion and tenure decisions of language program directors. Unfortunately, negative attitudes toward the scholarly nature of applied language studies remain a national reality to which a reduction in the publication requirements for language program directors may contribute.

As a profession that encourages scholarship and the advancement of knowledge, academia offers faculty different opportunities to develop as teacher/scholars. First, there is the opportunity to teach a variety of courses at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. There is the opportunity to teach courses in areas of specialization, thus blending research and teaching areas. Interestingly, over the years the idea has developed in some universities that the research of the language program director is in the language program alone (and for some this is true) and, consequently, that the language program director's teaching responsibilities should be exclusively in the language program. Colleges and universities wishing to attract the best candidates for a position as language program director invariably state that they offer the candidate the opportunity to work with language learners and to develop a language program. A perusal of the MLA job list will verify this observation. What these colleges and universities must realize is that these opportunities do not make them unique and do not offer the candidate an opportunity to develop intellectually equal to that offered to the rest of the faculty. (The anecdote cited in the introduction of this article is not atypical of conversations illustrating this point.)

Both the institution and the candidates seeking positions as language program directors must ask the following questions, the answers to which will vary from institution to institution, but are the basis for a healthy discussion between an employer and a potential employee. What can the department and/or university offer so that the candidate can realize his or her potential as a teacher/scholar? What immediate as well as long range opportunities are there for the candidate to teach in his or her area of specialization? For example, will an applied linguist be able to teach a course called Introduction to Foreign Language Learning Research? What is the possibility to teach courses for advanced undergraduate and graduate students? Are there realistic possibilities for creating language-oriented tracks (linguistics and applied linguistics) in the major, minor, and graduate programs? With which colleagues in the department and across campus involved in applied language studies can the candidate engage in professional exchanges? In essence, neither the institution nor the candidate should contribute to the creation of an isolated faculty member for whom the language program is an ivory ghetto. Teaching basic language courses can be very

rewarding. If the language program director, however, is the only faculty member who never teaches outside the language program, then an unfair and inequitable professional situation exists.

We would be remiss in our discussion if we did not point out the following rarely stated issue: in many departments basic language instruction is unfortunately viewed as less important than teaching junior- and senior-level courses or teaching at the graduate level. For whatever reasons, many faculty do not particularly value the teaching of basic language courses. Our intention in prompting present and future language program directors to aspire to be more complete academics *in no way* entails an argument against faculty teaching basic language courses. We do not agree with those who view language teaching as low in status and less worthy than teaching other offerings. On the contrary, our hope is that, by raising the status of language program directors (and applied language specialists in general), the scholarly activities of faculty members whose specializations are in second language acquisition, applied linguistics, and methodology will gain wider acceptance by language departments and these areas of study will be integrated into language department offerings.

A Three-Year Plan to Integrate the Language Program Director

Directing a language program is time-intensive. The differences between large and small language programs may not be so much the amount of time a language program director spends but rather how the time is allotted. Since the language program director is the one on whom ultimate responsibility rests, all of the following individuals or groups can potentially claim part of his or her time: 1) every student enrolled in basic language courses; 2) every TA employed by the department; 3) all those who wish to be employed as TAs by the department; 4) all the course supervisors; 5) the exam committee for every exam given in every course of the language program; 6) university and departmental committees that relate to undergraduate instruction; and 7) administrators and advisers who regulate general education requirements. These demands on an individual's time require more than the minimum number of office hours per week. It might be the case that the language program director's responsibilities include class observations and exam writing (rather than directing). These two activities alone require even larger amounts of time.

The reality of language program direction is that many institutions seek untenured assistant professors for the position. Yet in view of the

time-intensive nature of language program direction, it is our contention that language program direction should not be assigned to an untenured assistant professor. Ideally, no one below the rank of tenured associate professor should be assigned the task of language program direction. Within departments, what positions of administrative responsibility are held by assistant professors? Generally, heads and chairs, associate heads and chairs, and graduate advisers are not assistant professors. At the college or university level, most administrative positions stipulate that appointees must already have attained the rank of associate or full professor.

Our profession is rapidly changing so that "publish or perish" is becoming increasingly important at both small and large institutions. Many assistant professors now must publish more to earn tenure than some had to publish to be promoted to the rank of professor a decade ago. The new era presents significant challenges to beginning assistant professors who need to be nurtured, encouraged, and mentored as scholars.

Since at present many colleges and universities no doubt feel that they cannot yet assign language program direction to associate professors, we offer one plan that aims at integrating the assistant professor into the department and the university prior to assuming significant administrative responsibilities. Perhaps some will find the entire plan either impractical or inappropriate for their institutions. Yet it seems better to us to outline a mechanism that will allow an assistant professor to earn tenure and avoid the "revolving door" position rather than leave this important issue to fate. We propose a three-year plan during which time the responsibilities of language program direction are gradually assigned to a junior faculty member. The plan assumes that an assistant professor has been hired for his or her expertise in applied language studies and is being prepared specifically to assume language program direction on a long-term basis.

Year 1. The first year on campus would be spent learning about the university system and making contributions to the department's curriculum at all levels, not exclusively in basic language instruction.

Time must also be dedicated to uncovering and discovering the people and offices around campus that are critical to successful job performance as language program director. What are the department's as well as university's policies and procedures on placement and proficiency testing? How is placement carried out and who is responsible for it? If changes are desired, with whom would the language program director have to work? If language study is required, can a student petition to have the requirement waived? If so, under what circum-

stances? If so, what are the alternatives? Who decides on the waivers? Who in the dean's office is responsible for what affairs? How are students advised into language classes? Are there mechanisms for reaching academic advisers in the event there are changes in the language program? How are classrooms assigned to the department? Who is responsible for this? Can the department be assigned rooms other than dungeon-like basement rooms with immovable chairs? Is instructional equipment available? If not, are there funds that can be requested? If necessary, can class sizes be reduced? Who are the students? What are their characteristics? What are their abilities? How are they recruited? The answers to these questions are important to succcessful language program direction and should be answered through experience on campus prior to assuming the position. The answers to these questions come with time spent at the college or university and will allow the language program director to establish a program that reflects the realities of the institution.

The first year of an appointment would also be spent developing departmental curriculum in areas other than basic language instruction. As pointed out, applied language specialists have scholarly pursuits to share in the area(s) of their Ph.D.'s, as do their faculty colleagues. All faculty like and want to teach in their area of specialization and a faculty member in applied language studies is no different. Is there a Master's program focusing on applied language studies that can be established? Can an alternate undergraduate track in language studies be established? Can the undergraduate major or minor be offered elective courses in applied language studies? Are there interdepartmental courses to be developed and offered?

Last but not least, it is extremely important for the individual who is preparing to undertake a heavy administrative load to conduct and publish research as quickly as possible. The applied language specialist must immediately put into effect a research agenda. The first year of the appointment to a tenure track must be marked by robust scholarly activity.

To summarize, year 1 is devoted to meeting people, making connections, discussing changes, and laying the groundwork for directing the language program. Year 1 is also dedicated to integrating applied language studies into the offerings of the department. And, most importantly, year 1 is an intensive year of research activity. Such groundwork and integration at an early stage will hopefully prevent an ivory ghetto from ever being established.

Year 2. In the second year, the department would begin to anticipate potential changes in the language program. The future language pro-

gram director would begin to educate TAs by offering them a course on language teaching or assuming the instruction of an existent course on language teaching. Again, the future language program director is laying groundwork by creating interest rather than resentment in what will happen, thereby providing for transition and evolution rather than the perception of a revolution. Transition and collaboration is particularly important when an incoming assistant professor is taking over for another faculty member who has been directing the language program. The issues may be somewhat different when an incoming assistant professor is the first language program director the department has ever hired.

Our own experiences as language program directors allow us to tell future directors that although many TAs may be excellent instructors, many may be unwilling pupils in a course on teaching. For the course to be successful, it must challenge the TAs intellectually through discussion, debate, and latitude in research assignments. The course must be designed in such a way as to be a course focused on the *professional development* of the TA and not merely a "how to" course. As the future language program director offers this course, he or she will learn of the problems and questions to be addressed when implementing any changes in the language program and confront these not only from the director's point of view but also from the point of view of the instructional staff; a crucial meeting of the minds will take place. To offer the course before having to implement any changes in the language program will prepare the instructional staff to meet the demands of the proposed changes. At the same time, the language program director will have the opportunity to assess candidates for his/her support staff.

Year 2 of the appointment is also a critical period for the future language program director to progress on his/her research agenda. Intensive scholarly activity should characterize not only the first year of the appointment, but all the years prior to adding administrative work to the faculty member's workload. Scholarship will continue once administration has begun, but there will be an adjustment period during which the new demands of administration are balanced with commitments to research and teaching.

Year 3. Many colleges and universities review faculty in their third year of a tenure track position. By not immediately assigning a beginning assistant professor a heavy administrative load, the department can offer the future language program director the opportunity to develop some national and regional recognition as a scholar during the first years of appointment. If the initial three years are marked by a good deal of scholarly production, major research projects can be well underway, or even completed, by the fourth year so that their impact can be evaluated

in time for the tenure decision. By not assigning administrative work in the first three years, the assistant professor is given the time to develop a professional profile. The fourth, fifth, and sixth years are dedicated to maintaining and broadening this professional profile.

Year 4. During the fourth year, the assistant professor could begin to direct the language program. By this time, the assistant professor ought to have gained some recognition professionally and should be well connected in the department and in the university. The new language program director would have been allowed to develop as a scholar as well as as a teacher and would have made contributions to all levels of instruction in the department. It is only at the point when research and publication are well underway that an assistant professor can realistically meet the administrative demands of directing a language program.

Other Issues

The purpose of this article has been to focus on the beginning assistant professor whose responsibilities to the department include the direction of courses that comprise basic language instruction. Four main points have been treated: 1) the implications of reducing the publication requirements for a language program director who specializes in applied language studies; 2) the encouragement of scholarly activity; 3) the recognition of the link between certain duties and teaching; and 4) a three-year plan for integrating a new assistant professor into the department and into the profession prior to his or her undertaking administrative duties.

Outside the scope of the present discussion are a number of issues that deserve attention but that we can only mention. First, if the beginning assistant professor is the first language program director the department has ever hired, what should the department do with the language program in the first three years of the new language program director's appointment? The details of the transition must be worked out, but we caution departments not to place complete responsibility for the language program on a new assistant professor from the start of his or her appointment. Prior to the hiring of the new language program director the department must have provided *some* mechanism for supervising TAs and devising a basic language curriculum. Whatever system was in place is the one on which to base the transition to the system of having a language program director.

Second, language program direction is time intensive no matter if the duties are assumed in the first year of appointment or in the fourth. Should the duties of language program direction be the sole responsibility of one individual or should there be two directors with alternating

periods of administration? This is certainly possible. In this system, the two faculty members are able to alternate their activities between intense administrative duties and intense scholarly research. We know of at least one large university where such a system is in place.

Third, while many departments have come to accept the idea that the basic language curriculum must have a director, the advanced curriculum often remains unsupervised or unattended. Is there a coherent, articulated curriculum beyond basic language instruction? For example, how do the composition and conversation courses fit into the rest of the curriculum? How do the advanced undergraduate courses reinforce the concepts learned in the composition and grammar courses? Should there be a curriculum coordinator for the courses that follow basic language instruction?

Fourth, many departments have recognized that not all the duties traditionally given over to the language program director require the attention of a faculty member but can be delegated to support staff. What kind of support staff is necessary? Secretarial? Course supervisors? Who selects the support staff? The chair or head? The language program director? Both? What duties can be delegated and what duties are best left in the hands of the language program director? These issues, as well as those discussed in the article, would provide for a healthy dialogue between departments and language program directors.

Conclusion

Bearing in mind the CIC resolution outlined in our introduction, the contemporary view of the language program director is as a faculty colleague first and an administrator second. In recognizing the faculty status of the language program director, we have proposed in this article that the assistant professor who is hired as language program director be allowed to develop as a scholar and researcher before assuming time-intensive administrative duties. To accomplish this goal, the three-year plan we suggested is summarized below. The newly appointed faculty member should:

1) in year 1 become acclimated to the unversity system and department; learn the policies and procedures that will have an impact on the language program; offer courses in his/her area of specialization; become professionally active and implement a scholarly research agenda;

2) in year 2 begin working with the TAs offering a course on language teaching; continue to gain professional recognition and publish research articles;

3) in year 3 prepare for the third year review; bring major research projects to fruition; refine the course on language teaching;

4) in year 4 undertake language program direction; and continue developing, implementing, and publishing scholarly projects.

While this three-year plan may not prove viable for all institutions, we hope the spirit of the plan is clear and that there are elements of the plan that can be adopted by both small and large colleges and universities. The proposal views the applied language specialist as a teacher/scholar and applied language studies as a viable scholarly field that has a place in language departments. Our proposal recognizes that the administrative and academic demands on beginning faculty may be at odds with each other. Unlike the kind of reduced publication requirement described earlier, our proposal presents a plan by which the administrative responsibilities of language program direction are gradually assumed by a beginning assistant professor in applied language studies in order that he or she meet the challenges of the academic demands that will decide his or her future.

Acknowledgments

A version of this paper was presented at the annual meeting of AAUSC held at Monterey, California, November, 1988. We wish to acknowledge several people whose comments have contributed to the form this paper has taken: David Benseler, Thalia Dorwick, Francis Lide, Ivan Schulman, Irene Wherritt, one person in the audience at Monterey whose comments on the content of the presentation have encouraged us to express our ideas more clearly, and the reviewers and editor for their extensive comments on the manuscript. The final responsibility for both the ideas and their expression, however, remain exclusively ours.

Works Cited

Committee on Institutional Cooperation [CIC]. "Resolution on Language Program Coordinators." *Hispania* 69 (1986): 332. "Language Administrators Approve Resolution." *French Review* 60 (1987): 676 and *Modern Language Journal* 70 (1986): 161.

Dvorak, Trisha R. "The Ivory Ghetto: The Place of the Language Program Coordinator in a Research Institution." *Hispania* 69 (1986): 217-22.

Lee, James F. "Toward a Professional Model of Language Program Direction." *ADFL Bulletin* 19, i (1987): 22-25.

——. *A Manual and Practical Guide to Directing Foreign Language Programs and Training Graduate Teaching Assistants*. New York: Random House, 1989.

Magnan, Sally S. "The Applied Linguistics Cooperative: Today and Tomorrow." *Modern Language Journal* 67 (1983): 382-92.

Sadow, Stephen A. "Methodologists: A Brief Guide for Their Colleagues." *ADFL Bulletin* 21, i (1989): 27-28.

Teschner, Richard V. "A Profile of the Specialization and Expertise of Lower Division Foreign Language Program Directors in American Universities." *Modern Language Journal* 71 (1987): 28-35.

The Graduate Teaching Assistant in an Age of Standards

Joseph A. Murphy
West Virginia University

The teaching profession in the United States is moving rapidly to satisfy public demands for accountability. The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, a Carnegie Commission creation, hopes to issue a national license to qualified teachers in all major disciplines by the end of this century. The AATF has produced the first-ever statement of knowledge and skills required by beginning and advanced teachers of French (Murphy & Goepper, 1989). AATSP and ACTFL have identified general competencies for foreign language teaching. While the thrust of these movements is directed toward the improvement of secondary education, the standards themselves need not be limited to any particular level of the educational system. The knowledge and skills identified in these documents are vital curricular concerns for the entire educational community. One might even argue that the larger the educational system, the greater the professional development needs based on these statements.

Graduate teaching assistants (GTAs) play a crucial and highly problematic role in the basic language programs of American universities. As Allen and Reuter (1990, p. 5) claim, they are "a vital part of the academic life of the departments and universities employing them," both as graduate students and teachers of undergraduates. Their dual role as teacher and student has contributed to an ambivalent self-identity.

Although teaching assistantships "arose out of a need to attract capable students to graduate school" (p. 2), their existence at some universities today stems in large part from the pragmatic need to service large numbers of undergraduate students in core classes.

If it appears ambitious or even counter-productive to speak of higher standards in an era of teacher shortages, it is even more daunting to argue for professionalism in a corps of novices, whose appointment rests primarily upon the survival needs of an understaffed system of higher education. Traditionally, both departments and individual GTAs have adopted a "make the best of it" attitude in the discharge of their responsibilities. The underlying premise of this article is that such an attitude must be replaced by a commitment to the competencies outlined in the national standards now emerging. Failure to act upon this commitment will only widen the gap between new knowledge in the disciplines and the incorporation of that knowledge into a revitalized undergraduate curriculum. Such a lag in competency will doom institutions to a progressively inferior quality of instruction. The remainder of this article will highlight the most critical competencies in foreign language teaching and include specific suggestions for improvements in GTA training.

Proficiency Needs

Good language teaching rests on the bedrock of language proficiency. AATF posits as minimal for the beginning teacher the ACTFL Advanced level in speaking and writing and Advanced High for listening and reading (Murphy & Goepper, 1989, p. 11). Moreover, it is expected that exiting GTAs will have achieved Advanced High proficiency in the active skills as well. While Magnan (1986) reported median proficiency levels of fourth-year undergraduate majors at the University of Wisconsin as Advanced, all students in the group had spent time abroad. Moreover, 40% of the students scored below the Advanced level. Her findings roughly corroborate the 1967 Carroll study of language majors, which found an average proficiency rating of 2 to 2+ on the FSI scale (ACTFL's Advanced to Advanced High). She noted slightly lower levels for teaching majors in a report by Manley of the Texas Project, where 67% of 500 volunteer teacher candidates scored at the Intermediate High level or better. However, it is not possible to generalize from these limited data to other university programs, where experience seems to indicate the existence of numerous entering GTAs having proficiency levels below Advanced. In the face of such bleak reality, one is tempted to despair of attaining the desired level and to lower standards accordingly.

A more rational and courageous response would consist of looking squarely at the standards and *building competency-developing opportunities into every aspect of the graduate program*. Let us consider, for example, the all-important speaking skill. Advanced speakers (on the ACTFL scale) should be able to function in everyday situations and satisfy routine school and work requirements. They should also be able to "narrate and describe with paragraph-length connected discourse (ACTFL, 1986, p. 1)." It is clear that graduate classes taught in the target language (TL) will inevitably give students practice with the housekeeping and discussion vocabulary needed, incidentally, for lower-level instruction. Graduate faculty fully aware of student needs to "narrate and describe" can easily provide opportunities for such practice in almost any literature or civilization course.

Similarly, the Advanced writer can "join sentences in simple discourse of at least several paragraphs in length on familiar topics (p. 5)." The academic content of every graduate course taught permits and in fact cries out for such functional activity. The Advanced skill of being able to express oneself "with some circumlocution" warrants a certain tolerance of experimentation in graduate writing. However, one formidable obstacle stands in the way—traditionally, graduate research papers (the principal form of GTA writing) are treated as "finished products" rather than as key activities in a *process approach* to writing. Writing-across-the-curriculum has unfortunately not yet reached the celestial heights of graduate education. In foreign language departments, at least, there is little evidence that graduate faculty are being trained in process-writing and many are not even aware of the different types of writing which form the basis of the skill. Expressive writing, for example, plays virtually no role in most graduate programs. At least the literature in foreign language education contains no reference to this type of innovation in faculty development programs.

The Advanced High listener is able "to understand the main ideas of most speech in standard dialect" and "shows an emerging awareness of culturally implied meanings beyond the surface of the text (p. 3)." At first blush, it might seem almost axiomatic that consistent use of the TL in graduate classes would result in significant development of the listening skill. Research does not indicate such automatic skill transfer without *active responses* tied to the identification of main ideas and some overt recognition of the cultural information.

The Advanced High reader is in fact able "to follow essential points of written discourse at the Superior level in areas of special interest or knowledge (p. 4)." Thus, GTAs ought to be "Superior" readers in working with their course materials. This implies coping with exposi-

tory prose on unfamiliar topics (albeit within the student's range of academic interests) and reading a variety of literary texts "with almost complete comprehension and at normal speed." It includes the systematic use of extralinguistic knowledge and an awareness of aesthetic properties and literary styles. Above all, perhaps, it means *interacting with cultural texts* and the systematic use of *inferencing skill.* Presently graduate faculty *assume* that students possess the preceding skills, a presupposition not always corroborated by experience.

Much current graduate study in the foreign language involves some skill practice directly related to the development of second-language proficiency. Optimalizing this transfer of competency from graduate coursework to improved proficiency will depend in large measure upon more careful and *conscious planning* of graduate programs of study. Specifically, it will result only from the inclusion of GTA proficiency needs in the requirements of the program and in the curricula of individual courses. Unless these needs become the focus of attention in all discussions of program revision, little additional benefit can be derived. The following suggestions are offered to departments serious about the improvement of GTA proficiency levels toward meeting AATF Basic and, eventually, Superior standards:

1) The department chairperson has ultimate responsibility for efforts to incorporate proficiency-oriented activities into the graduate program. He or she must insist that all graduate courses be taught in the TL (the only exceptions being for non-language-specific methods and linguistics courses). Also, it is his or her responsibility to insure that the department has a corps of trained oral proficiency testers available.

2) Graduate faculty must be educated about (or reminded of) the nature of proficiency. *Specific departmental activity* is needed to generate interest in the topic of proficiency at the graduate level. This could be realized simply with informal discussions (even brown-bag lunches) during which faculty share ideas on how to help GTAs become more proficient in the language.

3) Where departmental graduate curriculum committees exist, they should place proficiency high on their agenda. For example, they too should mandate the exclusive use of the TL in departmental graduate courses.

4) Individual faculty should be *required* to demonstrate efforts to incorporate proficiency principles into their graduate teaching. At a minimum, this would entail creating a learning environment character-

ized by two-way communication in the TL. Moreover, such efforts should become part of the faculty evaluation process.

5) GTA evaluations should occur *periodically* throughout the program and proficiency checks should be an important part of those evaluations. Such reviews could take the form of an administered oral proficiency test, but they should include an evaluation of the GTA's proficiency in all skills based on performance in coursework. Evaluation decisions should focus more on demonstrated skills than on formal grades, which do not always correlate well with specific language competencies.

GTAs will routinely reach the recommended AATF proficiency levels only if graduate program administrators and faculty make a concerted effort to ensure that proficiency is a natural outcome of program requirements.

Culture

In the three-year deliberations of the AATF Commission on Professional Standards, culture proved to be the thorniest problem, the most elusive area of competence. Perhaps because its domain is so vast, consensus required much "give-and-take." That consensus "is based on the concept of culture as an organic whole made up of values, a grid through which one sees the world, habits of thought and feeling, and habits of interacting with certain social institutions and customs" (Nostrand, 1989, p. 14). The Commission identified three interrelated strands: sociolinguistic ability, certain areas of knowledge, and certain informed attitudes. Seelye's (1987) seven categories of cultural objectives provide another framework of needs for the professional foreign language teacher.

Analysis of the preceding two sources suggests an overwhelming educational task. What then can be reasonably expected of a fledgling GTA and how can this minimal expertise be ensured?

Clearly a selection of cultural priorities is in order. It matters less that one agrees with the following list than that each graduate program formulate a clear set of cultural goals based on national standards. The following are offered as a starting point for the discussion of cultural competencies needed by GTAs.

Sociolinguistic Ability

For use in their current teaching and in their future careers, GTAs:

1) *Should be able to meet all the demands for survival as a traveler.* For the GTA, this means especially knowing how to explain, amplify, illustrate, and apply the survival information found in textbooks used in undergraduate instruction.

2) *Should be able to explain terms commonly used in culturally related texts.* For the GTA, the terms should be rooted in, although not limited to, the content of undergraduate teaching materials. Graduate faculty should be aware of these terms and incorporate them into graduate coursework as appropriate occasions present themselves.

3) *Should be able to use appropriate language in common social situations.* Graduate faculty can help GTAs to appreciate cultural diversity by sharing their own experiences in "getting along" in the target culture and by discussing cultural settings, social organizations, and behavior rules (communicative competence). They themselves should be aware of "deep culture" and present, whenever possible, organizing principles that underlie surface facts. They should also incorporate standard (prestige) and regional forms of speech in their lessons. In brief, they need to become exemplars for teaching culture.

Knowledge

The well-prepared GTA:

1) *Can interpret most common authentic documents, schedules, maps, etc.* Enlightened graduate faculty can lead the way by incorporating realia into their own courses whenever possible.

2) *Knows the main historical periods of the country(ies) whose culture is (are) being taught.* Graduate faculty can help by putting literary events into an historical and social framework. Can discuss the educational system, politics, and social structure of the country(ies) in question.

3) *Knows the main geographical features of the country(ies) in question.*

4) *Can say how a country's institutions and customs regulate behavior, both of natives and of foreign travelers.*

Graduate faculty can help GTAs acquire pertinent cultural knowledge in a variety of ways. First, through their own teaching practice, they can demonstrate an awareness of the value of *authentic materials* as organizers of learning. They should encourage cultural dialogue in the use of such materials. They can insist on TL protocol (e.g., the use of TL in

class instructions, in communication, and in framing thoughts). Semiotic components can be added to language and to literature classes. Discourse analysis procedures can also be used in such classes (Moorjani & Field, 1983). Most importantly, vocabulary can be related, as always, to its cultural context (Lafayette, 1988). Culturally related pre- and post-reading activities can be adapted for graduate courses and written "explications" can be structured so as to include cultural analysis.

Attitudes

The well-prepared GTA:

1) *Is aware of stereotypes about the target culture and can explain their origins and inadequacy.*

2) *Can point out some indications of attitudes reflected in language, in quotations, in gestures, and in symbols.*

Graduate coursework in language, linguistics, and literature abounds in opportunities to explore (and explode) cultural stereotypes. The single most salutary way to do this is for professors to help students build cultural constructs befitting the complexity of cultural realities. When textbooks fail—as they most frequently do—to illuminate "the socio-political links between the cultural facts" (Kramsch, 1988, p. 83), it is the responsibility of a professor to do so. "Relations between facts should be sought at a sufficiently high level of abstraction to allow generalizations and meaningful contrast and analogy between the target and the native culture."

Development of GTAs

The preceding areas of knowledge are commonly represented in elementary language textbooks used by GTAs. As noted in the AATF standards document, they represent a consensus on the essentials of cultural competence (Nostrand, 1989, p. 14). The well-educated GTA will, at a minimum, be able to recognize cultural facts in a textbook and be able to place them into conceptual and value categories. The most effective instructors enliven the presentation of such abstractions with anecdotal evidence from their own experiences abroad. However, experience alone, while lending an invaluable authentic ring to a lesson, is insufficient: "To be more than an amateur observer, one needs to know how to relate the heterogeneous surface manifestations to underlying core elements" (Nostrand, 1989, p. 14).

It is the department's responsibility to provide a theoretical framework and training in cultural perception. This is best done in a themati-

cally organized, research-oriented civilization/culture course offered early in the GTA's program. Ideally, the themes and concepts alluded to in this course would be developed and "revisited" at several points in the coursework.

It is the university's duty to provide study-abroad opportunities for any GTA lacking such experience. For example, West Virginia University routinely staffs its study-abroad programs in France, Germany, and Colombia with GTAs from within the department. Many of its ESL candidates interrupt their academic work with a year of teaching experience in the department's cooperative program with the Berkeley House School of Languages in Tokyo. Such practice may affect only some GTAs but it betokens a genuine commitment to the cultural education of its students.

Linguistics

Linguistics illuminates much of the content of any language curriculum. As with culture, its scope is so broad as to intimidate and create problems in the selection of "minimal knowledge." AATF standards identify "Basic" competence as including the essentials of:

1) *Phonology;*

2) *Sound-symbol correspondences;*

3) *Lexicology and word-derivation rules;*

4) *Lexicography (the knowledge of dictionaries and how to use them);*

5) *Syntax and contrastive analysis;*

6) *Sociolinguistics (recognition of registers and levels of style);*

7) *Error analysis;*

8) *Acquisition and learning theory;*

9) *Cognitive learning style recognition;*

10) *Discourse analysis (recognition of spoken and written features beyond the sentence level)* (Walz, 1989, p. 19).

Moreover, the well-educated teacher can discuss these knowledge areas in relationship to the psychology of language learning and the methodology of L2 teaching. In other words, linguistics for the GTA must be "applied" in that it must clarify the nature of teaching materials and help the instructor in diagnosing learning difficulties and selecting rational learning activities. In addition to graduate coursework (out-

lined below), linguistic content needs to be incorporated into the "in-service" training of GTAs. Lesson plans should include the identification of linguistic features and objectives which are, at least in part, linguistically focused. For example, a lesson presenting direct object pronouns in French should include reference to the allophone [lez] in the spoken language.

This imperative would also seem to require *conscious coordination* of academic work in learning theory, linguistics (general and applied), and language teaching methodology. More precisely, it would seem desirable for the graduate program to include a minimum of one course in language acquisition theory, one in applied linguistics, and one linguistically oriented methods course.

The selection of appropriate teaching methods depends in large part on knowledge of the theoretical foundations of language teaching, providing "essential groundwork for the full understanding and use of methods and techniques" (Brown, 1987, p. xii). The domain of such knowledge spans topics like principles of human learning, first language acquisition, comparison of L1 and L2 acquisition, personality factors in L2 learning, sociocultural factors, interlanguage, error classifications, and so forth.

Experienced methods instructors know how frustrating it is to teach pedagogy in a linguistic void. When students in a methods class are unfamiliar with the tenets of contrastive analysis, generative transformational grammar, error analysis, and some of the newer concepts in linguistics, it is difficult, if not impossible, to give them—"en route"—the requisite background for working with contemporary instructional materials. A prerequisite course in the applied linguistics of their target language provides essential content needed for understanding current materials and methods. Equipped with such knowledge, students are prepared for linguistically structured projects in a methods class.

Schools which cannot afford this trio of experience will have to provide the training with some other mechanism. One possibility is to develop a one-term teaching practicum in which (outside) readings in linguistics are assigned and where lesson plans and supervisory efforts focus on linguistic content and problems. Such an approach would at least give GTAs minimal awareness of the role of linguistics in language teaching, while providing a forum for linguistically based discussions between GTAs and their mentors. An interesting research project might result from a comparison of these two strategies for communicating requisite linguistic knowledge.

Literature

There is a minority view that literature has no place in lower-level language instruction. This article assumes the opposite, if only because so many practicing teachers *want* to use literary models in their teaching. There may, of course, be disadvantages with certain uses of literature, but that topic does not fall within the scope of this article.

One might assume that since most GTAs teaching foreign language are themselves enrolled in a graduate literature program, their preparation in the study of literature would, *ipso facto*, be guaranteed. One can probably conclude that such students will have been exposed to "representative works in all genres, selected from all periods" (AATF Basic Level competence). However, there are predictable works by authors commonly selected for lower-level instruction whose inclusion in any given graduate program remains a matter of chance. In answering the question "What literature should be learned by high school teachers of foreign language?' the AATF Commission consistently received the answer "familiarity with authors and works most likely to be taught in the schools." Such a pragmatic view is likely to be rejected by graduate faculty whose perceived mission is to facilitate a comprehensive grasp of the literature of a country or area. To be sure, not all GTAs are preparing for careers in high school teaching. Yet the pragmatic response suggests that graduate programs in literature provide students at some point with experience in *the selection of literary materials for language instruction at both the high school and college levels*. Cooper et al. (1990) affirm that there is little difference in basic language courses at the high school and college levels. Thus, a third-year high school teacher or a GTA teaching the intermediate level might want to present literary passages.

Such pedagogical experience could take the form of simple class discussions about the complexity of a work, coupled with reflections on its psychological value for students of different ages. Graduate faculty have no formal responsibility to apply directly their course content to the ends of language instruction. Still, if sensitized to the pedagogical needs of some of their students, they could easily divert part of their curriculum to such an end. This is another area in which a chairperson could exert leadership by organizing workshops on how to teach literature (i.e., approaches to literary study).

Another minimal competence needed by all teachers of foreign language is familiarity with *the terminology needed to discuss literature in the target language*. One cannot assume that coursework in literature will, *per se*, result in such knowledge. Individual institutions will determine

how best to inculcate this skill, but graduate program policymakers must be made keenly aware of its value in the repertoire of skills needed by all L2 instructors above the FLES level. They could, for example, modify the department's *explication de texte* (*explicación de textos*) courses to allow a discussion of the most basic literary terminology. Moreover, this need provides further support for the requirement that all graduate courses be taught in the TL.

Finally, according to AATF standards, the teacher should experience in his/her literature courses at least some of the following: drama workshops, personalized responses to literature, connotation awareness exercises, the preparation of language exercises based on literary materials, schema-development exercises, literary analysis, and creative (expressive) writing (Murphy & Goepper, 1989, p. 18). It is probably not realistic to expect that all or even most of the preceding will be pursued in any particular program. Nevertheless, department chairpersons and graduate program planners should ensure that a variety of current approaches to literature is found somewhere in the education of the GTA. Implementation of AATF standards with respect to the teaching of literature will change the landscape of high school and college classrooms by creating a symbiotic relationship between administrative levels of education and between literature scholars and pedagogically oriented language teachers. One result may well be a renaissance of interest in the study of literature.

Methodology

Methodology in this article is taken to include the entire array of attitudes, knowledge and skill at the disposal of a mature teacher of foreign language. It is the total universe of knowledge from which the novice draws sustenance and support. It includes above all a *problemsolving mind set* posited as the essential skill of teaching.

If methodology is ever to consist of more than unreflected training sessions, it must be taught within a context of *professional development*. The ambivalence of the GTA role militates against desirable professional attitudes. Many GTAs simply do not see themselves as teachers but rather as students with research interests. The large majority see themselves in the proverbial "catch 22" because of the excessive demands of these conflicting roles. We have just glimpsed the numerous content expectations imposed on any L2 instructor. The addition of methodology, that ever-changing welter of *applied* concepts, adds a weight that is seemingly unbearable to a training agenda that is already overcharged.

"Training" is the operational word—unfortunately. The University of Louisville, like many who find that any GTA orientation program is insufficient (Altman, 1987, p.175), supplements an early orientation with two additional ones throughout the semester on topics selected by the GTAs from a list circulated by its Center for Faculty and Staff Development. It might be thus more appropriately called a GTA development program. GTA development programs take many forms including the issuance of program certificates, outstanding GTA teaching awards, first-year internships, the publication of GTA handbooks and even newsletters, video review sessions, and most commonly, courses on college teaching (Chism, 1987, pp. 126-7).

Education as opposed to "training" is a formative process which spans many years of one's professional life. (Murphy & Goepper, 1989, p. 29) At the University of California, Davis, GTAs are viewed as future faculty in need of an ongoing program of professional development. The University of South Carolina assigns first-year GTAs to a mentor faculty member who guides the novice through an apprenticeship of language teaching in a proficiency context.

A novice instructor presumably starts without knowledge of the techniques required for teaching the four skills. More importantly, he or she might not know how to set goals or make up tests. At the most critical level, the person might be unmotivated for teaching and/or deficient in strategies for motivating students. The broad sweep of methodology speaks to each of these problems and to countless others.

For example, the AATF standards distinguish Basic and Superior Levels of competence for methodology (Berwald, 1989). The former contains eight competencies ranging from familiarity with modern pedagogical developments to presentation of the (four) major skills, to managing classroom dynamics. AATSP, following the *ACTFL Provisional Program Guidelines for Foreign Language Teaching*, has identified three types of development: personal, professional, and specialist, defined as follows:

Personal Development—the knowledge, skills, modes of thought, attitudes, and leadership qualities derived from a strong liberal arts education;

Professional Development—the knowledge and skills derived from education and experience in the art and science of pedagogy;

Specialist Development—the knowledge and skills associated with being a specialist in the language and culture to be taught (AATSP, p. 1).

All three contribute, directly or indirectly, to the "methodology" needed by GTAs. Unfortunately, in the specialized world of university life, courses to foster personal development are usually assigned to

undergraduate programs in a liberal arts college, while professional and specialist development is the prerogative of education units outside a foreign language department. Thus, the new GTA suffers from a flawed educational system in which he/she enters graduate school deprived of requisite background knowledge. The problem is two-dimensional: (1) undergraduate programs in the liberal arts are often inadequate for personal development needs and (2) professional or specialist training in the rudiments of teaching is missing. This compound problem needs to be taken into account by anyone trying to reform the system. No panaceas exist, but the following discussion of methodology will include exemplary principles and practices designed to fill some of the void. One statement from the AATSP document holds promise as a pragmatic interim principle: "It is important that programs present theories and models proposed to explain learning in general and that this information be related to models hypothesized for foreign language learning through curricular or instructional linkage" (p. 7). With the limited time available for GTA development, it can safely be said that much background information will have to be imparted in the "hands-on" setting of foreign language instruction.

GTA inexperience with classroom techniques has been well-documented in the professional literature. Ervin and Muyskens (1982) studied GTA perceptions of basic teaching needs. Herron (1983) discussed the pressures on foreign language teachers to "humanize" their instruction. Schulz (1980) reported results of a survey on actual GTA training practices, as did Nerenz, Herron, and Knop (1979). Despite increased attention to the topic, curriculum planning for a GTA methods class remains clouded in subjectivity. The above-mentioned writers and others have, however, underscored certain critical concerns that form a core of topics generally endorsed by foreign language educators.

Ervin and Muyskens' subjects gave highest priority to: (1) learning teaching methods and techniques, (2) teaching the four skills, (3) teaching conversation or speaking, (4) making the class interesting, (5) making the best use of class time, (6) teaching grammar, and (7) inspiring/motivating students (p. 342). From the scant literature available and especially from experience with scores of practicing GTAs, one gets a strong impression that the highest priority should be given to classroom *survival skills*, the Monday morning needs of L2 instructors. Ervin and Muyskens agree, concluding that "the primary purpose of a TA training course should be to develop specific professional skills" (p. 343).

Of course, the more one plunges into the practicalities of language teaching, the greater the risk of myopia, of limiting one's vision to a surface structure of here-and-now reality. A more enlightened albeit

complex approach for both the GTA and graduate program leadership is to suffer that constant nagging sense of incompleteness, alternating between the satisfactions of task accomplishment and an unfulfilled need to expand one's consciousness in cognitive and affective areas of instruction. Future teachers need not fear the open-endedness of the task if they are taught to adopt an *i + 1* philosophy into their own learning styles and if they are given a panoramic sense of the job to be done.

AATF standards call for a minimum of *two* methods courses in order to insure exposure to the wide range of theoretical and practical matters encompassed by the field. One may or may not agree on the number of required courses in the already overcharged program of most GTAs. However, there can be no doubt about the large scope of needed pedagogical knowledge nor of the need to develop professional attitudes from the very beginning of the GTA's tenure.

Virtually every institution requires some form of orientation program for new GTAs. They vary from single-day sessions to two-week courses. Orientations provide basic policy information needed for instruction and often involve a kind of "mini-course" in methodology. Obviously new teachers must learn the rudiments of instructional planning and guidelines for good interpersonal relations (with their students, peers, and faculty). They must be readied for that daunting "first day of class," armed with a sure knowledge of the program philosophy, the nature of instructional materials in use, and essential organizational matters. The content of sessions may vary from department to department, but all seek to give GTAs a basic familiarity with acceptable procedures for surviving the early weeks of instruction.

West Virginia University adds a research facet to its orientation. GTAs receive an introduction to research in the department's optional research areas—culture, linguistics, literature, and methodology. They are encouraged to look for research topics not only in their coursework *but also in their instructional activities*. They are taught how to find authentic cultural materials and are taken to the library for a special briefing on reference sources especially useful for foreign language teaching. Most will build on this experience by taking a bibliography course in one of the four research areas. The important point is that, from the outset, research is presented as an activity related both to academic coursework *and to teaching*. This policy has resulted in a number of quality research papers on such topics as trends in L2 acquisition, cultural materials development, contrastive analysis of English and Chinese, and a model for using the fable to teach composition.

Methodology: Special Concerns

The teaching profession in the late twentieth century is characterized by concerns that have not traditionally been priorities in foreign language education. Three of them merit discussion here.

Preparation for Eclecticism or Broadening the Base of Permissible Options

Many L2 methodologists endorse an "eclectic" approach to language teaching. Few, however, consider the implications of such a proposition. Enlightened eclecticism does not just happen but depends on a judicious blending of objectives and techniques. Kramsch (1988) recommends a reframing of traditional questions asked in foreign language education, seeing both performance and competence as inextricably linked to the use of language in discourse. Just as there are different kinds of discourse, all inherently equal in their natural environments, one finds myriads of methods, each appropriate for a particular classroom "culture." Eclecticism too requires an "intercultural" approach based on openness to the many options in language teaching.

In order to effect such an aggiornamento, L2 methodologists should rethink their biases. Long-held antipathies to such traditional practices as translation, drill, bilingual vocabulary lists, and lecture, for example, will have to be re-examined in the interest of renewal. Judgment must be withheld until a fully developed articulated methodology emerges for comment. This is difficult when faddish terms like "communicative approach," "teaching for proficiency," or "humanistic teaching" determine what will or will not be allowed into the methods program. The following brief rethinking of lecture is offered as a case in point.

If L2 teachers (and especially methodologists) were polled to determine the most undesirable classroom activities, lecture would undoubtedly be at or near the top of the list. Yet Omaggio (1986, p. 375) admits it as a potentially legitimate means of teaching culture: "This strategy can be effective if teachers are careful to (1) keep it brief, (2) enliven it with visuals, realia, and accounts of personal experience, (3) focus on some specific aspect of cultural experience, (4) have students take notes, (5) use follow-up techniques in which students use the target language actively...."

In reading Allen and Reuter's (1990) analysis of the technique, one comes to see it in a more positive light. They cite its values as providing new information and insights, inspiring student interest in a subject, and presenting a living model of scholarship. It imposes on the teacher rigorous preparatory activities: developing a skeletal structure, provid-

ing elaborative details, and creating structural (transitional) signposts. To be successful, it must make ideas interesting, which implies, inter alia, "emotional as well as intellectual preparation." Finally, it involves real communication, which entails student feedback, incorporates ideas "in a vivid and tangible manner" and, at its best, invites class involvement, including questions and a peer exchange of reactions (pp. 81-91).

Are there not numerous parallels between these essential features of a good lecture and the time-honored practice of *presentation* in a foreign language class? This is not to suggest a one-to-one correspondence but just a recommendation to rethink this largely taboo subject in L2 methodology. Moreover, training in the proper use of the lecture technique creates another bridge between the GTA's academic work and his or her teaching.

Critical Thinking

Education today is largely a matter of teaching people how to learn. More precisely, it means teaching critical thinking skills, another largely neglected aspect of L2 methodology. The release in 1983 of the Commission on Excellence in Education's report *A Nation at Risk*, inspired a wave of reformers who argued, in the words of Darling-Hammond and Berry (1988) that "the present educational system did not prepare students for jobs in an increasingly technological society; teachers *must be prepared to teach not only basic skills but highly technical knowledge, and must stimulate students to think critically about the complex issues they will face in their lives and careers*" (author's emphasis).

The callow years of a graduate teaching assistantship are an ideal time to develop and pass on the strategies of critically-thinking language learners. According to Zimmer-Loew (1989), such people:

1) have insight into their own language learning styles;
2) take an active approach to learning;
3) are willing to take risks;
4) are good guessers;
5) are prepared to attend to form as well as content;
6) develop the TL into a separate reference system;
7) have a tolerant and outgoing approach to the TL.

Of course, one does find the "inductive teaching of grammar" in methods classes, as if inductive thinking could be confined to a two-minute generalization process. Zimmer-Loew has clarified the many ways in which L2 classroom activities incorporate common thinking skills and strategies. For example, it consists of concept formation (listing data, grouping data, labeling/categorizing data), interpretation of data (identifying critical relationships, exploring relations, making inferences), and the application of principles (predicting/hypothesizing, explaining predictions, verifying predictions).

Such operations are more than incidental by-products of language instruction. In fact, they go to the core of language competence and performance. Outstanding learners—teachers and students—instinctively use critical-thinking processes/techniques. Many, perhaps most, are but dimly aware of their presence in a dynamic L2 classroom. Future assimilation into L2 curricula of techniques designed to foster critical thinking will depend to a large extent on their prominence in L2 methodology. As seminal elements in education, they must first be *experienced* by prospective teachers, a further testimonial to the maxim "Nemo dat quod non habet" (One does not give what the self lacks).

The attitudes of critical thinkers are probably both innate and learned. The methods class, however, is one place where one can *reflect* on one's learning style and become aware of others. For the young GTA, it is an opportunity to crystallize a self-concept, albeit one that will change through the years.

Problem Solving

The foreign language profession has never given serious attention to the concept of teaching as a problem-solving activity. Yet experience tells us that good teachers, like most creative people, recognize problems, define them (in terms meaningful to themselves), propose solutions (consciously or instinctively), and note or measure the relative success or failure of their action. The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (1989, p. 2) has put problem solving at the center of its efforts to create a national license for accomplished teachers:

> The Board's standards will give weight to a teacher's disposition to act ethically in their student's interests, often balancing conflicting objectives. Emphasis will not only be placed on providing students with a deep understanding of the subjects they study, but also on developing their ability to reason and take multiple perspectives, to be creative and take risks, and to adopt an experimental and problem-solving orientation.

The life of a GTA is fraught with problems—content problems, methodology problems, and problems in professional relations. As novice teachers, they struggle to cope with daily requirements, like keeping up with a syllabus. Where in their training are they taught how to perform the essential function of teaching—problem-formulation and "action research to gauge the effect of a hypothesized solution? In most graduate programs today this training is simply not provided except through anecdotal comments and advice from supervising faculty and fellow GTAs.

In 1973, I proposed a problem-solving mini-course that could be used either in a methods class or as part of a practicum linked to the GTA's teaching. It starts with a sample tape in which an L2 teacher is guided gradually to state a classroom problem in observable terms and to come up with a plan for measuring its magnitude. Students proceed to interview each other, following the tape model but also asking questions appropriate to their circumstances. At the conclusion of their conversation, the interviewer writes a memo summarizing as concisely as possible the nature of the problem and the measurement plan. In a second interview (a week later), measurement data are reported and solutions discussed. One solution is selected, together with a new measurement plan. In a third (final) interview, pretreatment and posttreatment data are compared to determine the relative success of the proposed solution. The course teaches interviewing skills, memo-writing skill, and, most critically, the scientific spirit of teaching.

No doubt there are numerous other ways to present functional research skills to the GTA. Nevertheless, the point to be made is that national standards in an era of professionalism will almost certainly value problem-solving skills more than in the past.

Conclusion

We should follow the directions outlined in our emerging national standards as we reform our programs for guiding GTAs in their professional development. We need to create closer ties between graduate-level academic work and the instruction of lower-level language classes. Both facets of the GTA's dual role would thus be enhanced. As Allen (1985, p. 6) states, "There is no way to internalize knowledge more effectively than by attempting to explain it to others." In L2 study in particular, new knowledge needs to be applied without delay. Updated information and its instructional application will simply have to respond to the demands of modern times. The dual role of the GTA in contemporary universities can actually facilitate such an imperative. This will happen when GTAs infuse their instructional curricula with fresh

insights gleaned from graduate coursework which, in turn, will be renewed through exploration into pragmatic realms needed for effective undergraduate instruction (culture, applied linguistics, L2 learning theory, etc.)

Local graduate program reform must be undertaken with a clear understanding of *the process of educational change*. The Rand Corporation (Elmore & McLaughlin, 1988,) stresses three distinct components: policy, administration, and educational practice. We might consider policy to exist when local planners screen national standards for their applicability to local (departmental) needs. Administration involves the greatest flexibility: "At the administrative level, different localities may have extremely different needs and resources, so a reform with a single stated mission—to improve reading—may be implemented in a variety of ways." In the practice phase, teachers—GTAs in this instance—select those aspects of the new curriculum that fit into their existing teaching structure. While not as experienced as certified teachers, GTAs nonetheless have a vital role to play in the reform process. Policy works on a high level of abstraction but "reforms work only when they can accommodate regional and individual variability" (p. 2). Only GTAs can provide the feedback necessary to convert reform experimentation into an ongoing process of change.

Certain questions will need to be examined by all graduate program reformers. They include the following:

1) What nonteaching assignments does the department give to GTAs and how do they relate to instruction?

2) Are the duties sequenced so as to become part of the training program?

3) Is a GTA's special area of expertise (when present) utilized?

4) Is subject matter expertise assumed to develop simultaneously with graduate study or does the GTA experience require special kinds of training?

Such questions, coupled with the statements of professional competence now issuing from professional language teaching organizations, provide a firm foundation for the reform of graduate foreign language programs. If applied, they humanize the system by acting on the reality that GTAs are individuals with unique backgrounds. Initial assignments and training experiences should be, at least in part, tailored to individual needs. The numerous responsibilities of the GTA require structure and sequencing if the net effect of an internship is to produce development in line with national standards. Standards are for all practicing teachers.

It makes eminent sense to start applying them—benevolently, of course—in the education of a GTA.

Works Cited

AATSP. *AATSP Provisional Guidelines for the Education and Training of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese*. Unpublished manuscript. Ann Arbor, MI: AATSP, undated.

ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines. Yonkers, NY: ACTFL Materials Center, 1986.

Allen, R.R. & Theodore Reuter. *Teaching Assistant Strategies: An Introduction to College Teaching*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt, 1990.

Allen, W.W. "Toward Cultural Proficiency." *Proficiency, Curriculum, Articulation: The Ties That Bind*." Ed. Alice C. Omaggio. Middlebury, VT: Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1985: 137-66.

Altman, Howard B. "TA Training at the University of Louisville: Creating a Climate." *Employment and Education of Teaching Assistants*. Ed. Nancy Van Note Chism. Columbus, OH: OSU Center for Teaching Excellence, 1987: 174-76.

Berwald, Jean-Pierre. "Methodology." "The Teaching of French: A Syllabus of Competence. The Report of the Commission on Professional Standards, the American Association of Teachers of French." Ed. Joseph A. Murphy & Jane Black Goepper. *AATF National Bulletin* 14, special issue (October 1989): 21-22.

Brown, H. Douglas. *Principles of Language Learning*. 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1987.

Carroll, John B. "Foreign Language Proficiency Levels Attained by Language Majors near Graduation from College." *Foreign Language Annals* 1 (1967): 131-51.

Chism, Nancy Van Note (Ed.). *Employment and Education of Teaching Assistants*. Columbus, OH: OSU Center for Teaching Excellence, 1987.

Cooper, Thomas, Theodore B. Kalivoda & Genelle Morain. "Learning Foreign Language in High School and College: Should It Really Be Different?" *Shifting the Instructional Focus to the Learner*. Ed. Sally Sieloff Magnan. Middlebury, VT: Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1990: 127-50.

Darling-Hammond, Linda & Barnett Berry. *The Evolution of Teacher Policy*. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation, 1988.

Elmore, Richard F. & Milbrey W. McLaughlin. *Steady Work: Policy, Practice, and the Reform of American Education*. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation, 1988.

Ervin, Gerard & Judith A. Muyskens. "On Training TA's: Do We Know What They Want and Need?" *Foreign Language Annals* 15 (1982): 335-44.

Kramsch, Claire J. "The Cultural Discourse of Foreign Language Textbooks." Ed. Alan J. Singerman. *Toward a New Integration of Language and Culture*. Middlebury, VT: Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1988: 63-88.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Lafayette, Robert C. "Integrating the Teaching of Culture into the Foreign Language Classroom." Ed. Alan J. Singerman. *Toward a New Integration of Language and Culture*. Middlebury, VT: Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1988: 47-62.

Magnan, Sally Sieloff. "Assessing Speaking Proficiency in the Undergraduate Curriculum: Data from French." *Foreign Language Annals* 19 (1986): 429-38.

Manley, Joan. Personal communication, 1986.

Moorjani, A. & T. T. Field. "Revising and Reviving Textual Analysis in the Modern Language Curriculum." *ADFL Bulletin* 15, ii (1983): 12-18.

Murphy, Joseph A. "A Mini-Course in Problem-Solving." *Foreign Language Annals* 7 (1973): 248-49.

_____ & Jane Black Goepper (Ed.). "The Teaching of French: A Syllabus of Competence. The Report of the Commission on Professional Standards, the American Association of Teachers of French." *AATF National Bulletin* 14, special issue (October 1989).

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. *Toward High and Rigorous Standards for the Teaching Profession*. Washington, DC: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1989.

Nerenz, Anne G., Carol A. Herron & Constance K. Knop. "The Training of Graduate Teaching Assistants in Foreign Languages: A Review of Literature and Description of Contemporary Programs." *French Review* 52 (1979): 873-89.

Nostrand, Howard. "Culture." "The Teaching of French: A Syllabus of Competence. The Report of the Commission on Professional Standards, the American Association of Teachers of French." Ed. Joseph A. Murphy & Jane Black Goepper. *AATF National Bulletin* 14, special issue (October 1989): 14-16.

Omaggio, Alice C. *Teaching Language in Context*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle, 1986.

Postovsky, V. A. "The Priority of Aural Comprehension in the Language Acquisition Process." *The Comprehension Approach to Foreign Language Instruction*. Ed. Harris Winitz. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1981.

Schulz, Renate A. "TA Training, Supervision and Evaluation: Report of a Survey." *ADFL Bulletin* 12, i (1980): 1-8.

Seelye, H. Ned. *Teaching Culture*. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company, 1987.

Walz, Joel. "Applied Linguistics." "The Teaching of French: A Syllabus of Competence. The Report of the Commission on Professional Standards, the American Association of Teachers of French." Ed. Joseph A. Murphy & Jane Black Goepper. *AATF National Bulletin* 14, special issue (October 1989): 19-20.

Zimmer-Loew, Helene. "Let's Think About It! Integrating the Reasoning Skills into the Language Lesson." Unpublished paper, 1989.

Advancing the Case for an Advanced Methods Course

John F. Lalande, II
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Over the past two decades the foreign language (FL) teaching profession has broadened its scope through insights from research in related fields such as applied linguistics, sociolinguistics, and education—to name just a few. As the scope of research in FL teaching and learning has expanded, so has the number of research projects. As recently as one decade ago, FL methodologists had to search far and wide in order to locate quality research articles. Fortunately, times have changed. It has become the norm rather than the exception to find at least one research article per issue in such journals as the *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *Foreign Language Annals*, *Language Learning*, and the *Modern Language Journal*. The 1980s also witnessed the creation by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) of two awards bestowed annually in recognition of quality research contributions in FL learning, i.e., the Paul Pimsleur Award and the Emma Birkmaier Award. My own involvement in the selection committees for these awards has reinforced the view that the breadth, the quality, and the quantity of research contributions in FL teaching and learning have grown considerably.

The number of individuals whose professional commitment, interests, and experience are in FL methodology (rather than in literature or linguistics) has also risen substantially. Studies by Teschner (1987) and Schulz (1980) show that more supervisors and coordinators of graduate teaching assistants (TAs) now have the professional training and background necessary to carry out the full range of teaching, research, and service duties commensurate with their position. In response to the

needs of this growing body of professional Language Program Directors, a new organization was created in the past decade—the American Association of University Supervisors, Coordinators, and Directors of Foreign Language Programs (AAUSC). There is also evidence that more doctoral programs are furthering research in FL education (see Benseler, 1989). Even a database of FL educational researchers has been established.[1] New journals with a focus on FL methodology and/or applied linguistics have appeared, including, for example, *Applied Language Learning, Applied Linguistics, Applied Psycholinguistics, CALICO Journal, Cross Currents, Dialogue on Language Instruction, Journal of Language and Social Psychology, Language and Communication, Polylingua,* and *Treffpunkt Deutsch*. More and more universities are sponsoring conferences and symposia in FL learning and teaching; and the Modern Language Association (MLA) continues to increase the number of sessions devoted to FL methodology and applied linguistics at its annual meeting. These numerous developments—and others to be identified elsewhere in this article—cannot help but influence the nature of the methods course, just as they have influenced the very nature of the profession itself.

In view of such developments, this paper will argue that it is time to consider seriously a second or "advanced" course in FL methodology—a course required, like the first, of all TAs. Later, this paper will propose curriculum guidelines for such a course, considering differences between the basic and advanced FL methods courses.

The Case for the Advanced Methods Course

The profession is rapidly learning more about effective teaching and learning strategies. While it would be impossible to identify all important recent contributions to knowledge in fields related to second and foreign language learning, it may be helpful to consider briefly contributions in key areas:

1) cognitive and affective considerations (Disick & Barbanel, 1974; Moskowitz, 1978; and Christensen, 1975);

2) measurement and evaluation (Doyé, 1988; Oller & Perkins, 1980; Omaggio, 1983; and Valette, 1972);

3) use of ancillary materials, including authentic materials (Berwald, 1986, 1988; Edelhoff, 1985; and Kienbaum, 1986) and modern technology (Smith, 1989; and Hope, Taylor & Pusack, 1984);

4) learning styles of different groups, such as young and old learners (McLaughlin, 1984/1985), male and female learners (Ehrman & Oxford, 1989), disadvantaged learners (Myer & Ganschow, 1988; Roth,

1988), left- and right-brain learners (Williams, 1983), and field dependent and independent learners (Carter, 1988; and Witkin et al., 1977); and

5) development of FL skills and proficiencies, including listening (Byrnes, 1984; and Ur, 1984), reading (Cates & Swaffar, 1979; Swaffar, 1988; Schulz, 1983; Bernhardt, 1983; and Omaggio, 1986), writing (Cooper, 1977; Lalande, 1982; and Magnan, 1985), speaking (Helt, 1982; Hendrickson, 1980; and Kramsch, 1981), and culture (Kramsch, 1988; Lafayette, 1988; Lalande, 1985b, 1988b, 1988c; Morain, 1983; and Seelye, 1984).

Contributions in each of these areas have given the profession a clearer understanding of what is necessary for effective FL instruction. Just as the number of areas and the number of contributions within each area have increased, the quantity of information about effective FL instruction has risen dramatically since FL methods courses became regularly offered some thirty years ago.

The time has come to acknowledge this geometric explosion of knowledge and information by extending the methods course into at least one additional required course or, perhaps, into several optional courses in a seminar-style format.[2] Failure to do so, or failure to support such a move, could signal the presence of a troublesome mindset: the belief that a single course can completely prepare graduate students for a career in FL teaching. Such a view is clearly fallacious. What do we say to undergraduates who would like to believe that everything about FL can be learned in one semester or that everything about a foreign literature can be learned in a single survey course? We attempt to educate them to know better.

Granted, a second, advanced methods course would not guarantee improvements within FL teaching and learning. Nor would it offer a panacea for what ails the profession, or enable students to learn *everything* important to know about effective FL teaching. However, as stated earlier, it would provide for more exposure to topics generally given short shrift in the basic methods course. In so doing, its long-term effects on the development of FL teaching professionals ought to be considerably more beneficial than the present one-shot methods course found in most institutions of higher learning. A requirement of an advanced methods course should also contribute to a more positive perception of FL methodology as a discipline whose substance is not so thin that it can be examined, discussed, and treated comprehensively within a single course of instruction.

Three additional arguments support the creation of a second, advanced methods course for TAs. First, introductory or elementary-level methods courses must cater to the immediate survival needs of new

TAs, who are typically teaching elementary-level language courses for the first time. Practical concerns thus fill the basic methods course, at the expense of more reflective, critical inquiry into theories of learning and acquisition. Furthermore, these practical concerns relate mainly to teaching *elementary* courses. An inherent danger in such an approach is that TAs often emerge with the notion that intermediate and upper FL courses are to be taught with essentially the same strategies, techniques, and methods as elementary courses. The problem is still further compounded by the fact that financial pressures often force departments to put undergraduate students preparing for careers as school teachers in the same methods course as TAs beginning to teach at the university. This has been true at three of the four research institutions at which I have taught. My discussions with colleagues corroborate that the existence of combined graduate/undergraduate courses is rather widespread. The result, of course, is a further dilution of what should constitute a challenging introduction to the fields of FL methodology and applied linguistics.

Second, given the current national climate favoring higher teaching standards, proposals for an advanced methods course should be well received, even if they require a reallocation of funds and resources. As school teachers come under increased public pressures to justify salary increases through accountability, and as university personnel continue to justify tuition increases on the basis of providing a quality education, university administrators are listening, and more importantly, *asking* what can be done to improve teaching. This trend appears particularly prevalent at state universities, which, by nature of their special relationship to the public, must react more sensitively to public pressures. This same public demand for good teaching makes it difficult for university administrations to refute departmental requests for support to improve teaching, such as adding an advanced methods course and/or adding a faculty member to staff such a course. In summary, we should take advantage of the national demand for good teaching—for the sake of the profession and for our students.

Not to be overlooked either is support from within the profession for more professionally trained and competent FL instructors. As more and more states and FL organizations generate lists of expected competencies for FL instructors, it behooves us at the university level to ensure that our graduate students receive methodological training at least as thorough as that of their counterparts at the secondary school levels. The AATF (American Association of Teachers of French), for example, has already recommended that prospective elementary and secondary school French teachers take two FL methods courses (Murphy & Goepper, 1989). The same logic that compelled the AATF to recommend two

methods courses for prospective school teachers of French should apply to prospective teachers of French at the college/university level.

Third, an advanced methods course is desirable in view of the changing nature of our profession: from rigid specialization in narrowly defined fields to more renaissance-like breadth of study; from acceptance of only one or two methods of FL teaching to expectation of familiarity with many different methods. Today's candidates for university positions need to understand job announcements that speak of Rassias "method," TPR, Counseling-Learning, the Natural Approach, and Suggestopedia—to mention but a few. Moreover, even if a particular institution has not advertised for a faculty member who can teach with a given method, the interviewers may well solicit the candidate's views on various methods and techniques during the job interview process. Candidates who have enjoyed instruction in the theoretical and practical aspects of various FL teaching methodologies will no doubt find themselves more able to make a positive impression than candidates who can do little more than describe the method used at their home institutions.

Finally, just as methodologies have proliferated, so too have course types that graduating Ph.D.s may be expected to teach in their future departments. These courses include:

1) elementary through advanced language courses;
2) courses with a business application (e.g., *Wirtschaftsdeutsch*);
3) conversation and composition courses;
4) literature courses; and
5) graduate reading courses.

Clearly, the burgeoning and varied needs of our student population require greater familiarization with theoretical issues and pedagogical techniques than in the past. Advanced preparation in FL methodology should contribute not only to the increased effectiveness of TAs once they embark on their professional careers, but to their marketability as well. It is unlikely that understanding of several methodological approaches can be sufficiently developed in but a single course. The odds are far greater that it *can* be, though, if the opportunity is presented through a second, advanced methods course or a series of seminars.

In order to discuss more meaningfully the possible composition of such an advanced methods course, let us examine briefly the nature of what might be construed as a "typical" basic methods course in FL education.

The Basic/Introductory FL Methods Course: Some Perceived Characteristics

The nature of the "basic" FL methods course characterized here derives from a perusal of professional contributions (Garfinkel & Hamilton, 1976; Omaggio, 1986; and Rivers, 1981), from my own experience, and from conversations with numerous FL colleagues from various institutions. Basic methods courses for TAs typically treat the following points, often in this approximate order of priority:

1) administrative and pedagogical problems being encountered by TAs in the course they are currently teaching;

2) classroom management techniques;

3) techniques for "teaching" language skills and culture, often with micro-teaching opportunities to practice them;

4) use of teaching aids (audiovisual equipment, videos, tapes, and computers) and instruments for measuring student progress and for evaluating teaching materials;

5) sources of information about cultural materials, readers, authentic materials, and audiovideo materials;

6) theoretical and practical issues concerning language learning and acquisition in general; and finally,

7) popular methods past and present.

Regardless of the descriptions of basic methods courses, however, instructors tend to shift primary weight, attention, and application onto the elementary level(s) of FL instruction, as mentioned earlier. This seems to be true whether methods, materials, or curriculum topics are being discussed.

The Advanced Methods Course: Some Suggestions

The proposed components for an advanced methods course are not meant to be comprehensive or unalterable. Rather, they are intended to facilitate meaningful discussion within the profession about optimal, basic ingredients for its curriculum. The particular constellation of curricular components advocated below grew from my experiences with a pilot course at the University of Illinois during the summer of 1988. The goals of that course were:

1) to facilitate more effective and diverse language teaching in second- and third-year language courses;

2) to enhance the preparation of students for the varied teaching demands, challenges, and expectations of a changing educational world;

3) to increase the marketability of graduating Ph.D. students;

4) to promote respect of non–methodology-oriented graduate students for the disciplines of FL methodology and applied linguistics;

5) to meet the needs of experienced TAs and high school teachers who had not received methodological preparation for teaching postelementary FL courses; and

6) to provide an alternative, meaningful, and attractive in-service academic experience for (local) high school teachers.

Readers will note that high school teachers are mentioned in the last two course goals. Since my course was offered in the summer, and since I view advanced methods courses or seminars as opportunities to foster articulation and mutual understanding among school instructors and university instructors, I included both groups of teachers in the course design.[3]

On the basis of formal and informal feedback received from students upon completion of this pilot course, these goals were achieved. The two high school teachers who took the course rated it excellent; one expressed the wish that her basic methods course had been as interesting and useful. TAs felt that the course decreased their anxiety about teaching intermediate- and upper-level courses and gave them insights and techniques to make them more effective in these courses. They also felt that the discussion of effective FL teaching in second- and third-year courses offered them a useful review and reinforcement of FL pedagogy applicable to other levels of FL teaching. Two findings were particularly gratifying: that each of the eleven TAs in the course rated the course above average or excellent, and that those with prior teaching experience at the postelementary level wished they could have had such a course before teaching at these levels.

On the basis of this pilot course, I believe that TAs with approximately two years of teaching experience (regardless of the level of FL instruction) would profit most from the advanced methods course. Taking the course earlier may be necessary for TAs who will leave the program after the M.A.; however, for prospective Ph.D. candidates, a wait of two years places the experience of the advanced methods course more toward the middle of the TA's professional studies. As such, it still comes early enough to influence how the TA teaches and to reform poor pedagogical practices, and late enough to give the TA a base of experi-

ence from which to learn. I would even go so far as to argue that an advanced methods course of some sort be required of all Ph.D. candidates who aspire to a teaching career in FLs.

Ideally an advanced methods course should treat aspects of each of the following types of courses/activities:

1) graduate reading courses taken by non-FL graduate students to satisfy a FL reading requirement;

2) conversation and composition courses;

3) literature courses, either at the intermediate-level or upper-level survey; genre courses; and topics courses characterized by a four-skills approach;

4) foreign language for special purposes, such as for business and medicine;

5) adult education courses, including correspondence courses; and

6) extracurricular activities, including foreign language clubs, fairs, festivals, and honorary societies typically assigned to new assistant professors.

To provide this breadth of coverage, colleagues from within and outside the department should be invited to deliver guest presentations and share their particular expertise. This can only enhance the credibility of the information conveyed in the course, for few methodologists indeed have amassed the desired experience in all of these mentioned areas. In my own pilot course, for example, a colleague discussed the teaching of business German. Prior to his session, the class read two articles which helped sensitize them to some of the pertinent curricular and methodological issues. A colleague from French with substantial expertise in the teaching of graduate reading courses to non-French majors was invited to speak on that area. The practical information which these colleagues related from their experiences in teaching these courses made their contributions particularly useful and interesting. Another good example in point would be the teaching of literature. Graduate students would certainly be more interested in learning how to teach literature from a successful teacher of literature than they would be hearing about the same topic from a methodologist. In addition, extending invitations to literature colleagues to deliver guest presentations in methods courses might help break down departmental barriers where they still exist between language and literary specialists.

In my pilot course, considerable time was spent learning how to

identify which courses and which areas in these courses most needed attention. Essentially, this process was initiated in three ways: 1) by drawing upon TAs' experiences both as teachers and as students; 2) by listening and reacting to presentations delivered by colleagues with expertise in different types of courses and levels of FL instruction; and 3) by reading relevant contributions in the professional literature. In each instance the information was augmented by my own experiences and knowledge.

After having selected problem areas, TAs discussed possible solutions in terms of the skills and concepts necessary, desirable, and appropriate for a successful teaching/learning experience. For example, the importance of developing pre-academic listening skills in intermediate-level FL courses was discussed, with reference to work by Anderson-Mejias (1986). She points out that most intermediate-level FL courses fail to teach strategies for listening comprehension that would enable the FL learner to negotiate the leap from conversational exchanges to the kinds of lectures typically encountered in the third-year literature survey courses. Unless teaching/learning problems of this sort are anticipated and unless their solutions are discussed, both TAs and their students may suffer unnecessarily.

Two other problem areas identified were reading skill development (Bernhardt, 1983) and error analysis and correction (Walz, 1982). The issue is not whether TAs agree with the arguments and suggestions offered by Bernhardt and other reading specialists or by Walz and others who discuss learner errors. TAs need to be informed of the professional dialogue on these and other issues and encouraged to adopt, adapt, or at least react in some reasonable manner to the different needs of post-elementary-level students. Different levels of FL instruction require different methods of teaching reading and different techniques of error corrections, depending, of course, upon one's preferred methodological orientation. TAs can first brainstorm and then research which methods are indeed most appropriate for various learning styles and methodological approaches. Many more examples could be shared; however, since the primary purpose of this article is to motivate the creation or continued offering of advanced methods courses, further discussion about the process of identifying areas in need of pedagogical attention must be limited.

These and other identified areas served as springboards for discussing essential differences among the elementary, intermediate, and advanced levels of teaching and the *variety* of goals and effective teaching strategies appropriate to each. From such discussions and from assigned readings it became readily apparent what should be done differently,

more often, or less frequently, in particular FL classes. Needs that surfaced frequently with respect to several types of courses include the following:

1) **The need to create guided-learning activities.** One of the hallmarks of effective, engaging FL instructors is the ability to fashion pedagogically sound and interesting guided-learning activities. Instructors who possess such abilities are less vulnerable to textbooks that offer either too few activities, none whatsoever, or ones that have been poorly designed. In an advanced methods course, TAs can exchange and critique activities, thereby increasing their instructional repertoires and learning to create better activity sequences.

2) **The need to foster students' circumlocution skills.** Although the ability to paraphrase or circumlocute is important if students are to attain oral fluency, particularly at the Advanced level according to the *ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines,* instructors at the intermediate and advanced levels rarely teach these skills. How one might develop such skills is certainly an appropriate topic for the advanced methods course.

3) **The need to adapt textbooks to the needs of students and to suit personal methodological convictions** (see Guntermann & Phillips, 1982). In second-year courses, TAs are typically given more freedom to experiment with various approaches and even methods of teaching FLs than at the elementary level. For this reason, and since sooner or later TAs may have to use a textbook with which they feel uncomfortable, it is essential that they learn how to teach effectively regardless of the text being used. In short, they need to learn how to make the text work for them, rather than allowing the text to dictate to them what will be done, when, and how. As mentioned earlier, TAs in the basic methods course are normally too concerned with getting through their initial teaching assignment (usually a tightly structured elementary FL course) to benefit from discussions about supplementing or departing from a textbook, especially if it is a textbook for intermediate- and upper-level courses. Particularly if given as TAs move into intermediate-level courses, the advanced methods course can address these concerns when TAs are experiencing them.

4) **The need to know how to select and interpret placement and proficiency examinations, with special attention to global issues of vertical, horizontal, and public articulation** (Pesola, 1988; Lange, 1988). As more students study foreign languages in high school, the need for strong articulation between high school and college becomes even more acute. Probably related to new and strengthened admission standards

and proficiency requirements, increasing numbers of students are moving directly into second-year FL courses during their first year at the university. The shift in freshman enrollment from first- to second-year courses will no doubt make articulation from high school to college a major concern of college faculty in the future.

5) **The need to use standard, basic reference works (linguistic, communicative, cultural, and pedagogical) in teaching and to determine when and how these works might best be introduced to students.** Not only do TAs need to know how to find and effectively use reference books, they need familiarity with pedagogical resource materials such as films, slides, short-wave radio, and print and nonprint realia. In my pilot advanced methods course, each TA became acquainted with the rudimentary characteristics of computer software and video programs and reviewed one textbook or computer package: an experience not often provided through the basic FL methods course.

As for undergraduate students, many students do not know the difference, for example, between a review and a reference grammar. Often TAs and faculty falsely assume that students are being acquainted with basic reference works in *other* courses. For example, most German teachers assume that someone else at another level is introducing their students to *Duden*, and these students graduate without becoming acquainted with this most basic of German language reference works. In the advanced methods course, TAs can become familiar themselves with basic reference materials and discuss which are potentially most useful to their students at different points in their language learning.

6) **The need to become knowledgeable readers of research articles.** In order to continue developing professionally after leaving graduate school, TAs need to be good consumers of literature on FL teaching. In an advanced methods course, TAs could become familiar with major FL teaching journals by skimming several issues, identifying the coverage and affiliation of each journal, and writing a review of several articles. In reading these articles, graduate students would use the theoretical background in second language learning that they are acquiring in the advanced methods course. In addition to background in theory, students would need to learn the most basic concepts of research design and data reporting in order to interpret empirical studies. This adds yet another fruitful area to be taught in the advanced methods course. By learning to be good consumers of articles in professional journals, TAs would be on their way to writing for these journals throughout their careers.

Aware of both the immediate and long-term needs of TAs and of the realities of today's job market, which demands that prospective job applicants have fairly diversified teaching experience, faculty who design advanced methods curricula for graduate students should plan a course of considerable breadth. Such a course may well exceed the specific ideas suggested in this article. The guiding principle for determining the curriculum should be that an advanced methods course must acquaint students with the teaching and learning problems typically experienced by new assistant professors, instructors, and lecturers.

Conclusion

Advanced methods courses can represent a timely response to some of the public and professional needs before us. I believe that it is incumbent upon our profession to consider seriously an extension of the basic methods course into a second semester or quarter—into an advanced course or possibly into one or more seminars. No one can deny the remarkable expansion of the discipline of FL education in recent years. Therefore, the time has certainly come for the FL teaching community to recognize these developments and to seize the opportunity to better our profession during this climate of public and professional support for effective teaching. It is hoped that the case presented here for the desirability of the advanced methods course and the proposals made regarding the curricular design of such a course will help generate appreciation for, and momentum toward, the establishment of such courses on a profession-wide basis.

Notes

1. See the announcement by Ervin on page 22 of the *Modern Language Journal* 73, (1989).
2. At my own institution several seminars on methodological topics have been offered by various faculty in different departments: Alice Omaggio Hadley and Sandra Savignon (French), James Lee and Bill VanPatten (Spanish, Italian, and Portuguese), and myself (German). The topics have been quite varied and include communicative language teaching, proficiency, curriculum and materials development, research in second language acquisition, the development of reading skills, the integration of language and culture in the FL class, and the use of video in FL instruction. Each of the courses has been offered in such a way that students of different languages may enroll in the course since instructors provide language examples from more than one FL.
3. As a result of having a mixed group of TAs and high school teachers, there were other considerations for course design that will not be discussed in detail since they are beyond the focus of this article. I will mention, however, that in order to captivate and retain the interest of both groups, I focused the course mainly on issues germane to language instruction in general. For topics that did

not apply directly to the concerns of high school teachers (e. g. teaching graduate reading courses to non-FL majors), I used a problem-solving approach which could be applied to other situations. I would be pleased to supply more information upon request.

Works Cited

ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines. Yonkers, NY: ACTFL Materials Center, 1986.

Anderson-Mejias, Pamela L. "English for Academic Listening: Teaching the Skills Associated with Listening to Extended Discourse." *Foreign Language Annals* 19 (1986): 391-98.

Benseler, David P. "Doctoral Degrees Granted in Foreign Languages in the United States: 1988." *Modern Language Journal* 73 (1989): 315-31.

Bernhardt, Elizabeth B. "Three Approaches to Reading Comprehension in Intermediate German." *Modern Language Journal* 67 (1983): 111-15.

Berwald, Jean-Pierre. *Au courant. Teaching French Vocabulary and Culture*. Vol. 65 in *Language in Education: Theory and Practice*. Washington, DC: CALL, 1986.

_____, "Mass Media and Documents: Language in Cultural Context." *Toward a New Integration of Language and Culture*. Ed. Alan J. Singerman. Middlebury, VT: Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1988: 89-102.

Byrnes, Heidi. "The Role of Listening Comprehension: A Theoretical Base." *Foreign Language Annals* 17 (1984): 317-29.

Carter, Elaine Fuller. "The Relationship of Field Dependent/Independent Cognitive Style to Spanish Language Achievement and Proficiency: A Preliminary Report." *Modern Language Journal* 72 (1988): 21-30.

Cates, G. Truett & Janet Swaffar. *Reading a Second Language*. Vol. 20 in *Language in Education: Theory and Practice*. Arlington, VA: CALL, 1979.

Christensen, Clay B. "Affective Learning Activities." *Foreign Language Annals* 8 (1975): 211-19.

Cooper, Thomas. "A Strategy for Teaching Writing." *Modern Language Journal* 61 (1977): 251-56.

Disick, Renee S. & Laura Barbanel. "Affective Education and Foreign Language Learning." *The Challenge of Communication*, Ed. Gilbert Jarvis. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company, 1974: 185-222.

Doyé, Peter. *Typologie der Testaufgaben für den Unterricht Deutsch als Fremdsprache*. Berlin: Langenscheidt, 1988.

Edelhoff, Christoph (Ed.). *Authentische Texte im Deutschunterricht, Einführung und Unterrichtsmodelle*. Munich: Max Hueber, 1985.

Ehrman, Madeline & Rebecca Oxford. "Effects of Sex Differences, Career Choice, and Psychological Type on Adult Learning Strategies." *Modern Language Journal* 73 (1989): 1-13.

Garfinkel, Alan & Stanley Hamilton (Ed.). *Designs for Foreign Language Teacher Education*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1976.

Guntermann, Gail & June K. Phillips. *Functional-Notional Concepts: Adapting the Foreign Language Textbook*. Vol. 44 in *Language in Education: Theory and Practice*. Washington, DC: CALL, 1982.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Helt, Richard. "Developing Communicative Competence: A Practical Model." *Modern Language Journal* 66 (1982): 255-62.

Hendrickson, James. "Listening and Speaking Activities for Foreign Language Learners." *Canadian Modern Language Review* 36 (1980): 735-48.

Hope, Geoffrey R., Heimy F. Taylor & James P. Pusack. *Using Computers in Foreign Language Teaching*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1984.

Kienbaum, Barbara E. "Communicative Competency in Foreign Language Learning with Authentic Materials. Final Project Report." 1986. [ED 275 200.]

Kramsch, Claire J. "Teaching Discussion Skills: A Pragmatic Approach." *Foreign Language Annals* 14 (1981): 93-104.

_____. "The Cultural Discourse of Foreign Language Textbooks." *Toward a New Integration of Language and Culture*. Ed. Alan J. Singerman. Middlebury, VT: Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1988: 63-88.

Lafayette, Robert C. "Integrating the Teaching of Culture into the Foreign Language Classroom." *Toward a New Integration of Language and Culture*. Ed. Alan J. Singerman. Middlebury, VT: Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1988: 47-62.

Lalande, John F., II. "Reducing Composition Errors: An Experiment." *Modern Language Journal* 66 (1982): 140-49.

_____. "Making a Connection: Telephone Books, Culture and Language Instruction." *Die Unterrichtspraxis* 18 (1985a): 313-18.

_____. "Teaching Culture in the German Language Classroom: Toward Achieving a Balanced Perspective." *Schatzkammer der deutschen Sprachlehre, Dichtung und Geschichte* 11 (1985b): 70-80.

_____ (Ed.). *Shaping the Future of Foreign Language Education: FLES, Articulation, and Proficiency*. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company, 1988a.

_____. "Teaching Culture in the Intermediate Level German Classroom." *Die Unterrichtspraxis* 21 (1988b): 89-96.

_____. "Teaching Literature and Culture in the High School Foreign Language Class." *Foreign Language Annals* 21 (1988c): 573-81.

_____, Phillip Campana & Zaiga Mion. *Amerika in Wort und Bild aus deutscher Perspektive*. New York: Goethe House, 1985.

Lange, Dale L. "Articulation: A Resolvable Problem?" *Shaping the Future of Foreign Language Education: FLES, Articulation, and Proficiency*. Ed. John F. Lalande, II. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company, 1988: 11-31.

Magnan, Sally Sieloff. "Teaching and Testing Proficiency in Writing: Skills to Transcend the Second-Language Classroom." *Proficiency, Curriculum, Articulation: The Ties That Bind*. Ed. Alice C. Omaggio. Middlebury, VT: Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1985: 107-36.

McLaughlin, Barry. *Second Language Acquisition in Childhood*. 2nd ed., 2 vols. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1984/1985.

Morain, Genelle. "Commitment to the Teaching of Foreign Cultures." *Modern Language Journal* 67 (1983): 413-22.

Moskowitz, Gertrude. *Caring and Sharing in the Foreign Language Classroom. A Sourcebook for Humanistic Techniques*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1978.

Murphy, Joseph A. & Jane Black Goepper (Ed.). "The Teaching of French: A Syllabus of Competence. The Report of the Commission on Professional Standards, the American Association of Teachers of French." *AATF National Bulletin* 14, special issue (October 1989).

Myer, Bettye J. & Leonore Ganschow. "Profiles of Frustration: Second Language Learners with Specific Learning Disabilities." *Shaping the Future of Foreign Language Education: FLES, Articulation, and Proficiency*. Ed. John F. Lalande, II. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company, 1988: 32-53.

Oller, John W., Jr. & Kyle Perkins. *Research in Language Testing*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1980.

Omaggio, Alice C. *Proficiency-Oriented Classroom Testing*. Vol. 52 in *Language in Education: Theory and Practice*. Washington, DC: CALL, 1983.

_____.*Teaching Language in Context: Proficiency-Oriented Instruction*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle, 1986.

Pesola, Carol Ann. "Articulation for Elementary School Foreign Language Programs: Challenges and Opportunities." *Shaping the Future of Foreign Language Education: FLES, Articulation, and Proficiency*. Ed. John F. Lalande, II. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company, 1988: 1-10.

Rivers, Wilga M. *Teaching Foreign-Language Skills*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1981.

Roth, Volkbert M. (Ed.). *Kommunikation trotz gestörter Sprache. Aphasie-Demenz-Schizophrenie*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1988.

Schulz, Renate. "TA Training, Supervision and Evaluation: Report of a Survey." *ADFL Bulletin* 12 (1980): 1-8.

_____. "From Word to Meaning: Foreign Language Reading Instruction after the Elementary Course." *Modern Language Journal* 67 (1983): 127-34.

Seelye, H. Ned. *Teaching Culture: Strategies for Intercultural Communication*. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company, 1984.

Singerman, Alan J. (Ed.). *Toward a New Integration of Language and Culture*. Middlebury, VT: Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1988.

Smith, William Flint. *Modern Technology in Foreign Language Education: Applications and Projects*. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company, 1989.

Swaffar, Janet. "Readers, Texts and Second Languages: The Interactive Process." *Modern Language Journal* 72 (1988): 123-49.

Teschner, Richard V. "A Profile of the Specialization and Expertise of Lower Division Foreign Language Program Directors in American Universities." *Modern Language Journal* 71 (1987): 28-35.

Ur, Penny. *Teaching Listening Comprehension*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Valette, Rebecca M. *Modern Language Testing*. 2nd ed. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1972.

Walz, Joel. *Error Correction Techniques for the Foreign Language Classroom*. Vol. 50 in *Language in Education: Theory and Practice*. Washington, DC: CALL, 1982.

Williams, L.V. *Teaching for the Two-Sided Mind*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1983.

Witkin, H. A., C. A. Moore, D. R. Goodenough & P. W. Cox. "Field-Dependent and Field-Independent Cognitive Styles and Their Educational Implications." *Review of Educational Research* 47 (1977): 1-64.

Bridging the Gap Between Teaching and Learning: A Critical Look at Foreign Language Textbooks

Renate A. Schulz
University of Arizona and U.S. Air Force Academy

The last twenty years have witnessed considerable upheaval in foreign language teaching methods. Interestingly (some might be tempted to say fortunately), the textbooks published during this same period do not reflect that methodological frenzy. In fact, relatively little has changed in form and content since the heyday of audiolingualism and, as noted by Redfield (1988) and by Valdman (1988), there is a distressing homogeneity in teaching materials. We have an overchoice of nonchoices, all with the obligatory situational dialogs, set in a very reduced contextual framework, and intended to illustrate grammatical patterns or (in more progressive textbooks) language functions. Further, we find a simplified and grammatically graded reading text, usually focusing on some stereotyped cultural difference, followed by content questions and one or more bilingual vocabulary lists. But the largest part of each chapter continues to be devoted to metalanguage, focusing on grammatical explanations and paradigms, followed by mostly discrete-point exercises. True, many exercises are now "contextualized," i.e., the items to be manipulated are headed by a title which supposedly sets a contextual framework for the laboriously constructed sequence. But I have yet to meet a student who keeps track of "the story" while filling in prepositions or supplying verb or adjective endings.

Byrnes (1988) rather optimistically traces seven trends in recently published textbooks: 1) a trend toward functional language use with an accompanying "down grading" of grammar; 2) the attempt to specify goals in real-world tasks the learner is to be able to perform; 3) limitation of grammatical content load to reflect more realistic expectations of learner outcomes; 4) an emphasis of meaning over form, and an accompanying increase in communicative exercises over strictly manipulative exercises; 5) a growing incorporation of the receptive skills; 6) a recognition that learners possess different degrees of control over different tasks; and 7) the trend toward authentic language, frequently coupled with the demand for real-life tasks (p. 32). Given my own survey of available German materials, however, I could not verify a number of these trends.

Without question, the prefaces of recent textbooks read differently than those of yesteryear. They use all the right "buzzwords," such as "proficiency-oriented," "real language use," "functional/notional organization," "authentic language," "real life contexts," "communicative focus," "communicative tasks," "personalized activities," etc. A careful examination of the actual instructional sequences reveals, however, that we have a long way to go to translate current theories of second/foreign language acquisition and communicative language learning and teaching into practice.

In a recent study of four German textbook series intended for secondary schools, Johnson and Markham (1989, p. 42) concluded that "mechanical drills were dominant in the overwhelming majority of cases," although all textbook authors proclaimed a communicative orientation and communicative goals. The authors of the study reasoned that if a textbook proclaims an underlying communicative philosophy, it could be expected that communicative activities outnumber both meaningful and mechanical drills.[1] According to the Johnson and Markham study, however, communicative activities (i.e., exercises with unpredictable responses which necessitate the exchange of information to fill an information gap) made up only between 10% and 28% of the exercises in the textbooks examined, reflecting the still prevailing—though now hidden—belief that foreign language learning is mainly a matter of habit formation through mechanical manipulation of discrete grammatical structures. Even scholars, such as Finnemann (1987, p. 36), who see "considerable improvement in the quality of [recent] foreign language textbooks," admit that the grammatical syllabus remains the major driving force in foreign language instructional materials.

Few foreign language educators would dispute the fact that the textbook drives instruction, and that in the majority of classrooms it is

"the main source of guidance for both students and teachers" (Ariew, 1982, p. 16). A number of educators have, however, spoken out against the dominant role of the textbook in foreign language instruction. Hammerly (1982), for instance, states:

> One of the most harmful factors in a second language program is excessive reliance on textbooks.... They are always there, setting an unreasonably fast pace, always open, interfering with the development of the audiolingual skills and reinforcing the wrong notion that *the* language is what is found in books. The belief that a second language can be learned from textbooks is most damaging to second language learning and needs to be eliminated. Much would be gained by banning textbooks from the second language classroom, reducing them to homework and laboratory workshops subordinated to cassette tape recordings (p. 201).[2]

Critics of U.S. textbooks generally focus on four aspects: 1) the need to reduce the grammar load and implied expectation of mastery of the full range of grammatical structures presented; 2) the need to change from a grammatical syllabus to some other kind of organizational scheme, such as a functional/notional syllabus, a situational one, a proficiency-oriented syllabus (i.e., one based on the functional trisection of the *ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines*), or a thematic (i.e., culture comparative) syllabus; 3) the need to offer materials which illustrate authentic language—particularly oral language in programs where oral proficiency is a major goal; and 4) the need to change the content from the bland, middle class, sanitized touristic focus to information that offers an intellectual challenge.

Valdman and Warriner-Burke (1980) and Warriner (1978), for instance, express what many of us have felt for decades, namely that there is "Too Much Between the Covers to Cover" (Warriner, 1978, p. 551). Knop (1988) puts it in more earthy terms when she states that the best way to cover a textbook is to sit on it. But even the most recent textbooks continue to present a comprehensive overview of the grammatical structures of the target language. True, some textbook authors reassure the students that they are not expected to "master" all the grammatical paradigms. Such statements are, however, invariably followed by exercises which assume the level of active control just disavowed.

Bragger (1985) suggests that textbook and instructional materials be organized to reflect the functions, content/context, and grammatical accuracy expectations of the *ACTFL Guidelines*.[3] Since the *Guidelines* have, however, been criticized for their lack of theoretical underpinnings

as well as for their lack of empirical verification as to their appropriateness in the language acquisition process,[4] it would seem premature to use the *Guidelines* as the organizing principle for textbooks.

Walz (1986) points out that while the majority of recent textbooks proclaim to promote oral proficiency as a major, if not the major goal of instruction,[5] textbooks attempt to teach the predominantly oral modality through written language forms, in spite of the fact that oral and written language differ considerably, not only in channel of processing, but in morphology, syntax, lexical choice, sentence length, degree of redundancy, etc.

Some recent textbooks, particularly those espousing a "natural approach" attempt to increase the authenticity of dialogs by rendering basically conversational language in written form. To my knowledge, no one has yet addressed the *in*authenticity and hidden danger of attempting to teach an oral code through written language. Native speakers simply do not write as they speak! The call for "authenticity" requires that oral language remain oral (i.e., that it be presented by a live speaker, audio or video recording, and not by the textbook).[6]

Redfield (1988) belongs to that group of textbook critics who believes that the profession should devote less attention to method and more to content, i.e., to what we are teaching and why. He objects to the "language-textbook representation of life" where

> all the characters...are middle-class, and most of them are young. They have various adventures out in the world, eating in a restaurant, going to the theater, traveling, shopping, everywhere making conversation. The most threatening thing that ever seems to happen in these books is that someone gets lost and has to ask directions. We do not encounter here the language of terror or mourning, nor do they use language to persuade or seduce, to wheedle or denounce. The world of these people centers on objects, not persons; even in relation to objects, they consume but they do not produce. We never hear them talking while they work, or dealing with any problem of critical importance. They talk about the weather or their schoolwork, not politics or religion or terrorism or the fate of the earth.... Conflict is attenuated, and the relationships of the textbook characters are relatively superficial. They tease each other, but they never get angry; they go out on dates, but they never make love (pp. 14-15).

Redfield suggests that "an authentically cultural approach to language teaching would teach...obscenities, slang, baby talk, jargon, high style, and down-home all as part of one great variegated system" (p. 14) and

recommends that textbooks present people who speak a language that can engage the passions or the intellect.

What are some emerging insights, or commonly agreed upon tenets, based either on second language acquisition theory or empirical research which inform how languages might be learned, and which therefore also might inform the content and form of instructional materials? Let me give a thumbnail sketch of some of these currently prevailing theories. Because of space constraints, I will limit myself to a discussion of Acculturation/Pidginization Theory, Linguistic Universal Theory, Interlanguage Theory, Discourse Theory, and Krashen's Monitor Model.[7]

The *Acculturation/Pidginization Theory* advanced, among others, by Schumann (1978), holds that:

> Second language acquisition is just one aspect of acculturation and the degree to which a learner acculturates to the target language group will control the degree to which he acquires the second language (quoted in McLaughlin, 1987, p. 110).

This acculturation process depends mainly on social and psychological factors which determine "the amount of contact learners have with the target language and the degree to which they are open to the input that is available" (McLaughlin, 1987, p. 111).

Linguistic Universal Theory hypothesizes a universal, innate, biological language component in our genetic make-up. Thus, first or second language learners have all the principles of universal grammar available and only need the appropriate input (in quantity and quality) at the appropriate time for language learning to occur.

Of interest to us is that *Universal Grammar Theory* posits an "accessibility hierarchy," i.e., an inherent difficulty hierarchy of rules falling under a universal "core grammar" and a language-specific "peripheral grammar." It is hypothesized that to ensure acquisition, those rules falling under the language-specific "peripheral grammar" need to occur much more frequently in the learner's input than the "core" rules shared by all languages. Unfortunately, linguists have not yet made major progress in defining these core and peripheral grammars.

Error analysis studies conducted by adherents of Interlanguage Theory provide some evidence that first and second language learners make similar errors at similar stages in the acquisition process, regardless of their mother tongue, age, or way the language was acquired. Many of these errors are believed to be developmental and will eventually disappear, if the learner receives sufficient appropriate input.

Discourse Theory posits that learners develop competence in a second language not simply by absorbing input or studying grammar at the

sentence level, but by actively participating in communication. Interpersonal use of language, which involves negotiating meaning and filling information gaps, is considered essential for language acquisition to occur.

Krashen's *Monitor Model* is probably the most ambitious and widely known among the theories presented. This theory is also the only one from which direct pedagogical extrapolations have been made in the so-called *Natural Approach* (Krashen & Terrell, 1983). The Monitor Model proposes that learners have two processes at their disposal to develop language competence. One is "acquisition," which takes place subconsciously in natural language interaction; the other is "learning," which requires conscious analysis and takes place predominantly in instruction. Krashen has been criticized for his insistence that only "acquired language" is available for use in spontaneous communication and that formal learning has no effect on acquisition, except to serve as a monitor or editor for the learner's output, provided the situation permits such monitoring. Krashen also believes that comprehensible input is the sole necessary prerequisite to language acquisition, and that the amount of input the student will convert into intake is dependent on a low affective filter (i.e., on affective factors such as lack of anxiety, self-confidence, etc.). Finally, similar to adherents of Interlanguage and Universal Grammar Theory, Krashen is convinced that we acquire grammatical structures in a predictable order, regardless of the order in which they are presented by a textbook.

The theories mentioned focus predominantly on naturalistic second language acquisition. It would, of course, be foolhardy to draw a direct analogy between naturalistic and formal classroom language learning. There is, however, sufficient evidence to indicate that the two processes are similar in many ways.

What, then, might be implications of my theoretical meanderings for the development of instructional materials?

Regardless of how or where a language is acquired, we cannot deny the importance of attitude and motivation in the process. Terrell (1977, p. 328) convincingly argues that "language learning takes place when there is a real need and motivation for it," and that "the primary factors which influence L2 acquisition are affective and not cognitive." Secondly, the need for extended comprehensible input which helps learners shape their output to an increasingly closer approximation of the target language norm also seems to be beyond question. Thirdly, we need to take a critical look at findings from error analysis studies, supporting an Interlanguage theoretical view as well as the tenets of Universal Grammar Theory, that grammatical simplification and sequencing of materi-

als, structural analysis and discrete-point grammar practice—while temporarily improving performance on discrete-point tests—have relatively little influence on spontaneous language use. What does seem to improve spontaneous communicative competence, according to all theories discussed, with the exception of the Monitor Model, leads us to our fourth consideration: the need to interact repeatedly in meaningful situations, using the target language as medium of communication.

How would instructional materials need to change, if we no longer believed that the textbook determined the order of mastery? What would change if student errors were seen as stages in a developmental process, implying that errors do not necessitate an instant review and practice of grammatical paradigms, but an increased input of comprehensible language which repeatedly recycles the offensive structures in authentic interaction? What would need to change if we were indeed convinced that attitudinal factors determined to a large extent success in language learning?

I argue that second language acquisition theory and research make a convincing case that the traditional textbook—espousing a grammatical syllabus and intended for consecutive, page-by-page coverage in elementary or intermediate language instruction —is an insufficient and deficient medium for language teaching and learning. We need to broaden the palette of instructional materials to include systematically those available media that demonstrate and illustrate language and culture not just via the written word, but also via the ear, via the eye, via smell, taste, and texture, if possible, and via feelings triggered by what the senses perceive. In other words, we need to develop materials which lead the learner to *experience* the target language and culture(s) as much as it is possible outside the borders of a particular language area. Thus, the recommendations that follow will not just apply to the textbook per se, but will suggest the development of an integrated yet flexible package which uses available technology to tap the multisensory nature of language and culture and multisensory experience of language learning, and lets us adjust various instructional components to the needs and interests of individual learners and teachers.

Recommendation #1:

All current theories of language acquisition point to the importance of comprehensible input, and research indicates that extracurricular reading, for instance, can have a beneficial effect on language proficiency (Gradman & Hanania, 1989). Instructional input needs to be greatly increased through systematic use of instructional software, utilizing—besides the textbook—audio and video programs, computer

assisted instruction, interactive videodisc technology, and interactive audio instruction, accompanied by activities which permit the learners to interact with the content of the oral, written, and visual texts, and—even though only in simulated fashion—with the individuals portrayed in those media.[8]

This input needs to be relevant for the learners in question (see recommendation #2) and, of course, linguistically accessible. While "authentic" texts (i.e., nonsimplified, nongraded texts spoken and written by and for native speakers which meet the normal discourse constraints of a language) are, of course, preferable to artificial, simplified, and structurally seeded language, *accessibility* (in terms of content, communicative purpose, as well as lexicon and grammatical complexity) needs to be of primary concern in text selection, particularly in elementary language instruction. When we design lessons based on "authentic texts," particularly if they are of an oral nature (as implied in textbook dialogs or taped supplementary materials) or if they were originally intended for reading by educated native speakers, we need to remember that native speakers intuitively adjust their language output if they converse with or write to a foreigner whom they perceive to have limited language fluency. This so called intuitive "caretaker speech" can therefore be as "authentic" as speech between two native speakers. In McLaughlin's (1987) words,

> good input to second-language learners has their social needs in mind. It is selected for content and modified in form and presentation. It tends to be structurally simpler, more redundant and repetitive, and is characterized by greater structural regularity than is found in normal usage (p. 155).

I do not disagree with the need to teach students relatively early processing strategies for dealing with unsimplified texts, since outside the language classroom they will be unlikely to encounter texts of which they can decode every word and structure. Nor do I argue with the need to make students aware of various registers and discourse features of authentic oral and written language. Yet "authenticity" also implies that the language is used for authentic purposes, in authentic settings, and in ways appropriate for the participants. Thus "authenticity" dictates for instance that oral interaction be presented in oral form, be bound by clear visible, audible, or feelable contextual boundaries, and that native speakers adjust their output when conversing with limited proficiency speakers.

Recommendation #2:

To increase learner motivation, there should be an increased emphasis on content, i.e., on worthwhile, thought-and emotion-provoking information and interaction about the home or target language culture, about the world in general, or specific disciplinary knowledge apart from a description of the grammatical system.

Schema Theory suggests that comprehension and retention are increased if learners approach a text with certain expectations based on their existing background knowledge. As Kramsch (1988) suggests, this approach would dictate a comparative approach to culture study, where students need to describe, analyze, and explain *their own* culture before attempting to deal with unfamiliar concepts in the target language culture. Kramsch recommends appendices or supplementary booklets which provide home culture analogues to the facts presented about the target culture to allow for contrastive learning. She maintains that "whatever the students' degree of American cultural literacy... if they have not reflected on their own culture in a critical manner, they cannot appreciate the differences when presented only with the foreign cultural facts" (p. 111).

My call for a more content-based foreign language curriculum does not mean the elimination of formal grammatical analysis, explanation, or practice. Most language teachers would agree with Finnemann (1987, p. 36) that "it is pedagogically important to leave the learner with the sense that the target language is a structured system and not an arbitrary set of unrelated prescriptions for verbal behavior." It would be foolhardy and inefficient to deprive adolescent or adult learners with limited learning time of opportunities to derive grammatical generalizations. But even in grammar practice, meaning can take precedence over form, and worthwhile information can be conveyed. For instance, when teaching comparative adjectives, rather than comparing the height of a fictitious Melanie and Max, the textbook could lead to a comparison of the geographic features of various countries, the consumption rate of the world's resources by various nations, the standard of living of the target-language nation(s) compared with the U.S., etc. When teaching adjective endings, rather than describing some fictitious generic table or chair, an exercise could lead to the description of specific landscapes, artistic creations by target country nationals, their homes, or festivals. It goes without saying that grammatical practice can be greatly enhanced by computer or interactive video instruction, where the learner has instant access to helpful cultural or linguistic background information, immediate feedback, or grammatical correction.

Recommendation #3:

Based on insights derived from cognitive theory and memory studies which indicate a need for up to forty repetitions before a concept that does not have personal significance is remembered, there need to be systematic efforts at *recycling* not only vocabulary and grammatical structures but also situationally determined language functions (i.e., describing, expressing preference, complimenting, giving directions). Computer concordance programs enable us to check the frequency with which lexical items, grammatical structures, and various situational contexts appear. When examining currently marketed texts intended for elementary language instruction, it is surprising how many lexical items appear only once, with nevertheless an implicit expectation that students will retain and be able to use them.

Recommendation #4:

Communicative routines and language functions which learners might want to acquire for tourist or other purposes remain an important goal of communicative language instruction, since they permit learners to function relatively early in a variety of everyday contexts. Such linguistic routines are, however, best taught via videotaped examples of actual situations where the routines are appropriate. The use of interactive videodisc would permit the learner not only to observe a situation in a culturally appropriate context, but also to engage in simulated interaction with native speakers.

Recommendation #5:

Exercises and learning activities will need to present meaningful language in a meaningful way and require that students concentrate on specific informational content *in addition* to structural forms. Clearly, the need remains for skill-getting and skill-using activities as proposed by Rivers (1972). But strictly mechanical exercises, such as substitution drills and many forms of transformation or completion drills—even those that pretend to be contextualized—should be few. Communicative language use requires a purpose or need for communicating and an exchange of information.

It should be clear by now that I am recommending instruction where the textbook no longer dominates the classroom. Rather than consisting of one monolithic volume, instructional packages might consist of a series of separate components.

Primarily, we need **a large selection of reading materials** (either bound into a reader or—better yet—left as independent text packages which can be exchanged for more current material as it becomes avail-

able), including different text genres, with exercises that focus on the content of and personal reaction to interesting, informative, or entertaining texts. This text/information component, developed according to schema theoretical principles, would provide the content, ensure the necessary recycling, and provide opportunities for interaction.

For grammar instruction, the package could offer a **relatively stable, basic simplified grammar/workbook**, combined with an **imaginative computer program** that offers meaningful and communicative exercises focusing on particular structures. The computer will, of course, do what computers do best: it will give immediate correction and feedback on structural or lexical errors; will provide instant access to explanations, translations or vocabulary lists; and, in the style of computer adaptive testing, will continue offering exercises until a student can demonstrate an awareness of the grammatical pattern in question. This instructional component would provide skill-getting activities, integrated, however—whenever possible and appropriate—with personalized, communicative skill-using activities.

Also included with the instructional package should be a **series of audiotapes with interesting oral interactions set in specific situational contexts**, including dramatic readings of stories, *Hörspiele*, discussions, poems, and songs. While the tapes might present dramatic readings of texts presented in the reader, taped oral pattern drills—those that make the rounds on most current audiotape series— are taboo, since they go counter to any conception of "authentic oral language use" or communicative language teaching. Furthermore, they are perceived by most language students to be boring. This component would provide authentic oral language samples from a number of different native and nonnative speakers, and insights into varieties of oral registers, dialects, and discourse styles—all accompanied by comprehension exercises.

Last, but not least, we should have access to a **set of videotapes** or, ideally, **interactive videodisc programs**, which demonstrate situational exchanges in culturally authentic settings, entertaining dramatic vignettes, and information on aspects of the target language culture. This segment again presents content, insights into the target language culture, and opportunities to observe communicative interactions between different speakers in different contexts. The accompanying exercises would, again, focus mainly on comprehension as well as on cultural comparisons and contrasts.

I see these various components structured into a system of exchangeable and interchangeable building blocks—ideally consisting of "loose-leafed" texts with accompanying activities, individual disc, tape, and cassette programs, pedagogically annotated and held together by

instructional guides. Such flexible materials would permit an instructor or student some choice in the selection of reading or viewing texts, based on personal interest and/or pedagogical conviction. Each "building block" would be analyzed and carefully cross-indexed as to text type, linguistic difficulty level, topic/theme, dominant grammatical structural patterns (if any), language functions/type of discourse illustrated, length, and any other feature which might be useful to the language program coordinator or individual teacher in "building" his or her own instructional sequence. An additional advantage of such flexible materials would be that components (e.g., texts presenting cultural information) could be easily exchanged if they were outdated or if more appropriate texts became available.

The question at hand is, of course, who would develop and/or publish such multifarious materials? Clearly, the effort called for cannot be completed by any one individual author or materials developer. Teams of collectors/selectors/adapters and writers/"didacticizers"/creators/producers/etc. must be established here and in the various target cultures. If commercial publishers are not interested in developing such packages or would find the concept unprofitable, clearinghouses could be established by the professional language associations which could serve as collection and distribution points for the materials.

When selecting instructional materials, we have all felt that "the perfect textbook is yet to be written." The concept presented would permit each language program—to a much larger extent than is now possible—to compile an instructional series which reflects its own pedagogical convictions and instructional goals. Further, the flexibility permitted by this building block system would be a boon to articulation between courses and/or levels, since selected segments could easily be reintroduced for recycling, review, and practice. The flexibility permitted in material selection could enhance cooperation and enthusiasm of experienced teaching assistants or other personnel teaching multisection lower division courses by permitting some personal choice of texts and activities within the set parameters of a program.

Unfortunately, the suggested materials would not alleviate the need for careful and extensive TA training and supervision. But the "self-compiled" teaching package would facilitate close coordination between instructional goals, materials, and teaching practice, and would ensure that classroom instruction follow closely the teaching and learning principles expounded in our methods courses, rather than follow the lead of a textbook which may not reflect our goals or current insights into language learning and teaching.

With the above-described instructional package, classrooms of the future will utilize the available instructional hour for oral input, personalized information exchanges, discussions of texts, clarification of problems, and viewing of appropriate video programs. Outside of class, students will be expected to do selected readings, listen to appropriate sequences of audiotapes—either in a language lab or on their Walkman—work on grammar exercises in the workbook or on a home computer, and review the video programs on the home VCR or work on interactive video in the university's media center. Such carefully guided and integrated use of instructional materials could realistically triple the average 200 minutes per week input and practice time available in conventional instruction, and ensure the time and motivation necessary to reach and retain at least a perfunctory fluency in the language, even for students who are limited (or limit themselves) to the traditional two years of language study. In the final analysis, the traditional textbook alone has very limited potential for developing communicative proficiency. Limited to the printed word and lifeless, two-dimensional illustrations, it cannot show how language fits into and interacts with its cultural context. Other media need to be used to stimulate additional senses and to involve the learner as closely as possible in experiencing the target language and culture without actually being present in a target language environment.

For those who consider my recommendations futuristic, let me point out that the majority of postsecondary institutions already have access to the required hardware and facilities necessary for implementing my proposal. The problems encountered in implementing the concept will be due not so much to a lack of resources; rather they are due to an outmoded conceptualization of what foreign language learning entails, and the prevailing attitudes and established traditions and practices of language teachers as well as publishers and textbook authors. Our students can only benefit if our instructional materials reflect critical insights gained from current second language acquisition theories and the growing body of language learning research available.

Notes

1. For a classification of language learning exercises, see Paulston and Bruder (1975).
2. The notion that the textbook should serve as an out-of-class resource rather than as an in-class instructional guide is supported by a number of educators, particularly those espousing a natural approach. See, for instance, Krashen and Terrell (1983).
3. The *Guidelines* referred to are the *ACTFL Provisional Proficiency Guidelines*.

Hastings-on-Hudson, NY: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1982.

4. See, for instance, Bachman (1987).
5. For similar criticism, see also Clausing (1974).
6. Incidentally, even those textbooks that come with an audiotape component often do not use the software to present authentic conversational exchanges for comprehension and reaction, but instead offer mostly oral pattern drills.
7. These and other language acquisition theories are discussed in more detail in McLaughlin (1987) and Ellis (1986).
8. For a discussion of how interactive videodisc technology can foster simulated interaction, the reader is referred to Schulz (1988). For an example of a specific program which illustrates the interactive potential of the medium, see Gale (1983).

Works Cited

ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines. Yonkers, NY: ACTFL Materials Center, 1986.

Ariew, Robert. "The Textbook as Curriculum." *Curriculum, Competence, and the Foreign Language Teacher*. Ed. Theodore V. Higgs. Skokie, IL: National Textbook Company, 1982: 11-33.

Bachman, Lyle F. "Problems in Examining the Validity of the ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview." *Proceedings of the Symposium on the Evaluation of Foreign Language Proficiency*. Ed. Albert Valdman. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, 1987.

Bragger, Jeannette D. "Materials Development for the Proficiency-Oriented Classroom." *Foreign Language Proficiency in the Classroom and Beyond*. Ed. Charles J. James. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company, 1985: 79-115.

Byrnes, Heidi. "Whither Foreign Language Pedagogy: Reflections in Textbooks—Reflections on Textbooks." *Die Unterrichtspraxis* 21 (1988): 29-36.

Clausing, Gerhard. "Replicated Spoken German in Beginning Textbooks—An Appraisal and Proposal." *Die Unterrichtspraxis* 7 (1974): 66-77.

Ellis, Rod. *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Finnemann, Michael D. "Liberating the Foreign Language Syllabus." *Modern Language Journal* 71 (1987): 36-43.

Gale, Larry E. "Montevidisco: An Anecdotal History of an Interactive Videodisc." *CALICO Journal* 1, i (1983): 42-46.

Gradman, Harry L. & Edith Hanania. "Language Learning Background Factors and ESL Proficiency." Paper, Conference on Research Perspectives in Adult Language Learning and Acquisition, Columbus, OH, November 1989.

Hammerly, Hector. *Synthesis in Second Language Teaching*. Blaine, WA: Second Language Publications, 1982.

Johnson, Jo Ellen & Paul L. Markham. "Evaluating Secondary School German Textbooks: How Communicative Are They?" *Die Unterrichtspraxis* 22 (1989): 41-45.

Knop, Constance. "Developing Students' Oral Proficiency." Workshop, Joint Meeting of the Central States Conference and the Southwest Conference on Language Teaching, Denver, CO, April 1988.

Kramsch, Claire J. "Beyond the Skill vs. Content Debate: The Multiple Discourse Worlds of the Foreign Language Curriculum." *Language Learning and Liberal Education*. Ed. Peter C. Patrikis. The Chicago Conference on Liberal Education and the Consortium for Language Teaching and Learning, 1988: 98-113.

Krashen, Stephen & Tracy Terrell. *The Natural Approach: Language Acquisition in the Classroom*. Hayward, CA: Alemany Press, 1983.

McLaughlin, Barry. *Theories of Second Language Learning*. London: Edward Arnold, 1987.

Paulston, C. B. & M. M. Bruder. *From Substitution to Practice: A Handbook of Structural Pattern Drills*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1975.

Redfield, James. "Notes of a Native Speaker." *Language Learning and Liberal Education*. Ed. Peter C. Patrikis. The Chicago Conference on Liberal Education and the Consortium for Language Teaching and Learning, 1988: 10-20.

Rivers, Wilga. "Talking Off the Tops of Their Heads." *Speaking in Many Tongues*. Ed. Wilga Rivers. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1972: 20-35.

Schulz, Renate A. "The Interactive Videodisc and Its Potential for Second Language Acquisition." *Die Unterrichtspraxis* 21 (1988): 55-59.

Schumann, John. "Social and Psychological Factors in Second Language Acquisition." *Understanding Second and Foreign Language Learning: Issues and Approaches*. Ed. Jack Richards. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1978: 163-78.

Terrell, Tracy D. "A Natural Approach to Second Language Acquisition and Learning." *Modern Language Journal* 61 (1977): 325-37.

Valdman, Albert. "Variation in Student Orientation and Linguistic Variation in Foreign Language Instruction." *Language Learning and Liberal Education*. Ed. Peter C. Patrikis. The Chicago Conference on Liberal Education and the Consortium for Language Teaching and Learning, 1988: 22-33.

Valdman, Albert & Helen Warriner-Burke. "Major Surgery Due: Redesigning the Syllabus and Texts." *Foreign Language Annals* 13 (1980): 261-70.

Walz, Joel. "Is Oral Proficiency Possible with Today's French Textbooks?" *Modern Language Journal* 70 (1986): 13-20.

Warriner, Helen P. "High School Foreign Language Texts: Too Much Between the Covers to Cover." *Foreign Language Annals* 11 (1978): 551-57.

CALL Today: Implications for Multisectioned Language Programs

Robert Ariew
University of Arizona

In the late '60s, as a graduate student, I was doing computer-assisted literary research. At the time mainframes were the only type of computer available, minicomputers having just made their appearance and being still jealously guarded by the departments that owned them. Microcomputers were, of course, still several years away. I was entering data on a keypunch, a big, cumbersome machine whose purpose is to make appropriately spaced and sized square holes on card stock. The collection of cards (the "deck") was then to be "input" into the machine as data. A program, written in SNOBOL4, was to generate a concordance of my text. I was busy entering the data, one line at a time on the cards, being sure not to make any typographical errors. Several people came into the computer laboratory, one of whom came over and curiously asked what I was doing. I told him I was entering my text data. He immediately laughed, and, as he was rejoining his friends, told me, "Didn't anybody tell you computers are for numbers?"

Several weeks later, I was again at the keypunch in the computer laboratory, entering data. This time, a group of us humanities students had the idea to type in recipe ingredients from the most commonly available cookbooks and generate an index for them. The index would reference those recipes in the cookbooks that called for, say, potatoes. If a cook had a bunch of potatoes and wanted

> references to recipes that included potatoes, he or she would open our index and find all recipes that called for them. I was sitting at the keypunch with the *Joy of Cooking* open and was busily typing in ingredients. This time the reaction of those around me was more pronounced. Some even questioned my masculinity.

Computing has evolved in the last three decades. Computers are no longer conceived as machines for numbers. The contrary is now true. With the widespread use of word processors, computers are now used mostly for text input, including indexing. Computer assisted language learning (CALL) has also evolved, especially since the introduction of the microcomputer. Entire new subfields have emerged, including desktop publishing, hypertext, and multimedia. Similarly, computers are used in teaching foreign languages in entirely new ways. Interactive videodiscs, digitized sound, digitized color graphics have all made their appearance and have modified our perception of computers. We now can "browse" databases with impunity. While early activities such as drill and practice have remained as useful foreign language learning activities, they are now given a more restricted role.

Just as different uses have multiplied, so have the number of people that use computers today. No longer the exclusive domain of computer scientists, engineers, and scientists, computers are now used by a wide variety of people with different goals. To the administrator, the computer is now a tool used to manage a number of courses, registrations, budgets, etc; in twenty years, it may also be part of an integrated system that matches instructors' availability with specific classes, managing enrollment predictions with available resources. To the faculty, it may be a tool for research, a means to prepare a manuscript, a means to communicate with colleagues, and a general purpose manager of information such as bibliographies; before long, we can expect it to become a multimedia manager which allows the integration of voice, video, and graphics into presentations. To directors of language courses, it may be a means to prepare common examinations and presentation materials for use in classes; within a few years, we can expect it to become a tool for small group collaboration where the members of the group work together writing, editing, and refining materials. To teaching assistants, it may be a way to store class grades, to compute means, averages, and other class statistics, and to write papers for classes; eventually they may be writing their lesson plans directly on computers and presenting multimedia materials with them. Finally, to students, it may be a way to do a wide variety of exercises and to write a paper; someday it may become their principal source of information.

This article attempts to categorize and describe the old as well as the new modalities of use. It targets novice computer users as well as more experienced ones. Before proceeding, however, a few things must be made clear. The discussion will center on types of uses (for presentations, communication, etc.), not uses in specific subject areas (such as in teaching literature, teaching grammar, etc.). For a description of recent projects in subject areas, see Smith (1989) in the bibliography. Another thing to clarify is that one must be very careful when writing lists since categories of computer use (and of users) overlap quite a bit. It can be argued that it is precisely in these overlapping areas that innovations are happening. The overlaps will be pointed out below.

Presentations

The first category of use is very broad. Presentations include all uses of the computer which prepare materials for passing information orally or in writing. This category is listed first since it is overwhelmingly the most common use of computers today. It includes document preparation through text processing, database management, and use of spreadsheets. It also includes the preparation of overhead transparencies, illustrations, and handouts for oral presentations. With the advent of graphic-based machines, presentations now routinely include graphic illustrations. Other related uses have also become possible, such as computer assisted drafting, graphic design, and the preparation of blueprints and layouts.

Document preparation is routinely done in foreign languages as well. Even nonalphabetic languages can now be entered, displayed on computer screens, and then printed on paper or sent to a correspondent through a modem. (We are already overlapping functions; see "Communications" below). More specific to CALL, special types of documents are now being prepared: exams. Using a database program to keep and manage exam questions, many language teachers and teaching assistants are using the computer for computer managed instruction (CMI). They are selecting questions and printing master copies of quizzes and examinations, often on ditto masters for duplication. Similarly, using spreadsheet-like software, language instructors are keeping track of student grades and their progress in classes and doing interim grade calculations with computers. Some exams are even designed to be administered on machines. These exams take advantage of the microcomputer's fast evaluation capability and also of the possibility of designing tests that are adaptive—computer adaptive tests (CAT) where questions that are more appropriate to the student's abilities are presented.

The computer itself is now being used as the medium for presenta-

tions. Since the computer display can be enlarged for group viewing by means of a liquid crystal display device (such as the Kodak DataShow), the microcomputer, especially a portable one, becomes the medium of presentation and can afford the ability of displaying graphics, making animated presentations, and even playing digitized high-quality sounds. These on-line presentations are now being made in classes, as a kind of animated, graphic blackboard with multimedia capabilities. They suggest that a set of prepared materials may be written to illustrate elements of a language class. The materials can be shared by the teaching assistants in charge of a section of the class. These same materials could also be used by adjunct faculty to extend large courses by offering them in a variety of modes (at night, short course, adult learning, intensive courses, etc.).

One of the most powerful new uses of microcomputers is desktop publishing (DTP). It represents an overlap between graphics design and word processing. A relatively inexpensive workstation which includes a high-resolution laser printer and a graphics-capable microcomputer is used to merge graphic elements, text, lines, and headlines into a publication. Many departmental publications (handouts, newsletters, alumni communications, recruiting pieces, etc.) as well as course materials (syllabi, lesson plans, handouts, etc.) may be prepared in this manner. University publishers are now making use of DTP to publish monographs. Textbook publishers have also adopted DTP for foreign language workbooks and laboratory manuals.

In the future: Presentation will include not only voice and color graphics, but also color live-action video. Appropriate scenes will be transferred to the presentation and shown on projecting devices. Most word processors will have desktop publishing capabilities and will also allow the integration of images in page layouts.

Communications

It can be argued that the microcomputer is nothing but a sophisticated communication tool and that it is best used when disseminating information among users. By merging microcomputer resources via local area networks, people are now able to work in task groups, sharing peripherals such as printers, scanners, modems, etc., and also sharing the same database, adding to it, modifying it. In CALL, local area networks make it possible to share the same software (through site licensing arrangements with the publishers). Teachers do not have to ask students to hand in separate diskettes, but can access scores and other student information stored in one common device. Laboratory directors can also update information and software in one location rather than

having to modify dozens or even hundreds of individual diskettes.

Local area networks are also making it possible to send electronic mail among the members of the network. It is possible, for instance, to establish a messaging system for teaching assistants where the director could send a message to all members or to selected ones. Teaching assistants could also send messages to each other or to the director. Messaging systems may eventually replace the countless short messages and signs that clutter departments of foreign languages. Similarly, using a modem and the telephone system, microcomputer users can access information stored on remote devices. Bulletin boards (computer-accessed private messaging systems) routinely make available software, data, graphics, etc. Large networks such as bitnet, internet, and arpanet also allow users to exchange information worldwide. It is not unusual today to make article submissions via bitnet. The article, having been written on a word processor, is then sent to the editor via a communication network. This not only saves time, since the transmission is usually made within the same day (typically within an hour), but also money, since bitnet is usually provided free as a university service.

Commercial services are also available that can give the user the ability to communicate with others, to draw from large caches of information as well as to participate in forums (conferencing). Forums are communication areas where users can ask and respond to questions, take part in ongoing debates, and exchange information. Contributors typically review software and hardware and give opinions about processes and computer services. One of these forums is of special interest to the foreign language educator since it specifically targets communication in the discipline: the foreign language educator's forum on CompuServe (a commercial bulletin board). Researchers and directors can join the interactive forums, post questions to be answered by the members of the forums, or answer questions posted by others.

In CALL, local area networks may be used as a means to improve students' foreign language skills. Forums and electronic mail messaging services can be used among students collaborating on the network. Students may communicate on-line (simultaneously write to each other and read what others are writing), leave messages, and comment on each other's work. Forums on local area networks are becoming the electronic, written analogs of small group work in foreign language classes.

In the future: Personal computers will continue to have a local storage capacity, perhaps in the order of 100 megabytes of information (100 million characters). However, they will also have access to a much larger database. Using dedicated data lines or even cellular telephone

communications, computers will have access to gigabytes (billions of bytes) or even terabytes (trillions of bytes) of information from remote databases. The user will probably not know (or care) where the information is stored, but all of it will be available, regardless of the configuration of the computer itself.

Research

Research and computers form an ambiguous pair. It is ambiguous because of the dual nature of the computer: the computer may be a tool or a vehicle for research. As a tool, the computer is a sophisticated device that can store information gathered during experiments (for instance, latency of response, time between display and response, time to read instructions, etc.). Having collected information during the experiment, the researcher then analyzes the data (normally with the same computer) and makes generalizations.

As a vehicle for research, computers are also routinely used to evaluate the effectiveness of computer assisted instruction (CAI) or CALL materials. Students may be asked to give their opinions about material they experience (affective research) or data may be gathered about how well they perform (quantitative research).

It has also been argued that computers are affecting how people perceive and acquire information. Computers allow people access to information in a different way than books: in a more random-access mode. While books are much more linear in their format (book indexes do allow for some measure of random accessibility), computers are much more flexible in allowing random access. While computers are responsible for providing a new way to look at information (in a random-access mode), they may also be able to document for us how this can benefit (or cripple) learning.

The matter of documentation is important in research. Here again the computer has been proven to be a very useful tool. Much library work—for example, searching, retrieving, cross-referencing, and collating—is done by computers nowadays. By merging the computer's communications capabilities with its strengths in search and retrieval, libraries can now offer remote services. Researchers can now request library services from their office or from home via modem.

In the future: Researchers will have access to a kind of programming that will allow them to define a set of actions that the computer will perform at a later time (in the background, while other applications are idle). The tasks will be performed somewhat intelligently and somewhat independently. For instance, the researcher may specify that the computer search external databases for bibliographic information that meets

criteria previously set, download that information to a local storage device, rewrite it to conform to an accepted bibliographic format, and alphabetize it. The program will also be able to act as an assistant and assign levels of priority or importance to the information, identifying it as most appropriate or less appropriate.

Of course, the cursory treatment above does not do justice to the growing complexity of the computer as a research tool. One needs only look at any scholarly journal (in any field) to understand that there are indeed very few areas of research where the computer has *not* made its mark.

Instruction (CALL)

CALL undeniably has evolved and become more sophisticated in the last few years. The most telling evidence is that the original basic assumptions about CALL no longer hold true: the types of CALL activities once considered axiomatic no longer seem to be absolutes; the old definitions about what CALL is and is not simply do not serve well today. Tutorials, drill and practice, simulations, and games are no longer the only four categories of CALL activities. The clear distinctions that this taxonomy implied have become blurred; qualifications must now accompany the taxonomy. Moreover, CALL, at its most popular and implementable forms, used to rely on small, inexpensive, and readily available hardware, such as the Apple II family of machines. While the Apple II is undeniably still a vehicle for much CALL activity, the discipline is beginning to consider much more "hefty" hardware, with new and much more powerful capabilities. In short, the assumptions made previously about hardware do not seem to hold true either.

Types of CALL-based Activities

A decade ago, CALL categories were well-understood and were still very useful in shaping lesson materials. These "classic" categories are described below.

Tutorials are lesson materials that consist of explanations, principles, and definitions through which the student acquires new knowledge. Questions are presented at appropriate intervals to check on understanding of concepts. Responses are judged as either correct or wrong and appropriate branching is provided to maximize understanding and learning. Tutorials are conceived as interactive books that provide more or less information according to the student's learning as evidenced by answers to appropriate questions. Tutorials are used as an integral part of many CALL materials. For example, tutorials typically precede drill

and practice materials to ensure that students have understood the rules on which the practice is based.

Drill and practice is a distinct type of activity that stresses application of concepts and works with discrete points. Its goal is to reinforce students' knowledge and to remedy any weaknesses through error diagnosis and correction. Help sequences are made available either to refresh the student's memory or, when errors occur, to restate the rules which may have been misunderstood. Drill and practice is also characterized by repetition of the same or similar tasks. One typically finds drill and practice materials for formation of verbs and tenses, use of pronouns, etc.

Simulations present a real-world analogue to the student for the purpose of teaching the intricacies of a particular process. In this type of material, there is no predetermined algorithm to solving the problem or to understanding the process. Students are free to explore a multitude of available paths and are given a wide choice of possible actions to perform. Because of the difficulty in designing meaningful or realistic linguistic simulations, they have not been widely used in CALL, but the number of examples is growing.

Finally, CALL **games** involve solving small problems or overcoming obstacles in a competitive format. Games are typically fast-paced and involve acquiring points. Essentially drill and practice activities jazzed up (with accompanying sound and color graphics) and with a goal (scoring routines), they are used typically to check on student progress, while, at the same time, "lightening up" the didactic process.

While the more traditional uses of CALL have been superseded, as we will see below, they remain an important and well-defined area of instruction in foreign languages. Many instructors rely on computers to have students practice grammatical structures. The computer thus assumes the role of an electronic workbook, giving students the opportunity to perform "linguistic calisthenics." The time saved in grading, the effectiveness of the medium as a repetitive drill master, and the fact that the computer seems to make the activities more acceptable, all justify this type of use.

Advances in CALL have also been made in new and more creative uses of traditional software. For example, drill and practice, while still used quite extensively in foreign language study, now occupies a new niche in the learning process. Jones and Fortescue (1987), among others,

argue that the computer as drill-master still has a place in the learning environment since it can free up the instructor who can then spend more time interacting with individual students and give them more face-to-face communicative practice. The benefits of using CALL in that way are even more obvious in multisectioned language programs with teaching assistants as instructors. The teaching assistant does not have to spend time with the more routine aspects of drill and practice and can be assured that, if the students have spent some time in the computer laboratory, they will be familiar with the material. Along the same lines, Clark (1988) proposes that CALL should be seen as "a part of the total instructional system which also includes the live teacher, textbooks and other print materials, outside-of-class learning opportunities, and numerous other non-technological components" (p. 5). Similarly, students who are given free rein to explore (or "browse") databases are learning by discovery (and by doing). This kind of free-form learning is very much reminiscent to some of the more modern classroom techniques such as group learning or student-centered learning. Jaffe and Lynch (1989) propose that the computer should now be conceived as a Personal Learning Workstation (PLW), where students take more responsibility for their learning and where the computer provides as much or as little information as requested. Just as teachers' roles have evolved from leaders to facilitators of instruction, computers are now seen as facilitators of instruction. Instead of limiting the use of a computer to a one-to-one setting, teachers are also using them as information providers for small groups. Young (1988) further proposes that it is precisely in the area of learner-interaction analysis that CALL will make its greatest impact.

New Categories

More recently another category of CALL activity has been introduced: **tools**. This category describes the use of the computer as a resource, as, for example, when students use the microcomputer to solve a broad problem. In this case, the machine itself does not hold the solution to the problem, but is a means to solve it. The clearest and most often cited example is using the microcomputer as a tool for writing. Typically, pre-writing software (tutorial software) helps the student define a topic, while word processing software (tool software) makes the editing and re-editing cycle much easier. In addition, the computer can help the student check certain aspects of grammar, spelling (many word processors now include spelling checkers in several languages), and vocabulary (thesauruses are now also available in word processors), as well as with conjugation and grammatical rules (databases with grammatical

rules are now becoming available; see for instance *Système-D*, software for writing French).

Even with the introduction of this new category of CALL activities, there seems to be an uncertainty about the adequacy of the taxonomy of CALL activities. In 1984 Hope writes:

> In foreign language CAI, this typology quickly breaks down. Good tutorials involve extensive practice and "simulate" the classroom. Drill is often dismissed as mechanical or "Skinnerian," largely because weak programs offer the student little help in reaching a correct answer. Advanced types of structural practice probably should be classified as problem solving. Simulations may be little different from drill if they can handle only a small number of precise foreign language responses to a given situation; if they use multiple-choice questions, they may be better classified as reading exercises. While we use the traditional classification scheme, we recommend that it be viewed skeptically, especially when these terms are invoked in a judgmental fashion, in order to heap scorn upon drill, or to extol the glories of simulation. Good CAI materials in foreign languages seldom meet the challenges of the field in predictable ways (p. 18).

In 1987, again being very cautious about the adequacy of the traditional taxonomy of types of activities, and aware of recent pedagogical changes in foreign language teaching, Ariew and Frommer write: "Although these classifications may have sufficed when computers were first used in language learning, they no longer cover the wider range of formats made possible by improved technology and increased experience" (p. 179). In that same article, another new category is proposed: **contextualized activities.**

Contextualized activities are especially important in foreign language learning because they emphasize the language content along with structure.

> Contextualized activities require greater involvement by students than occurs in drill and practice exercises. Consisting of units of text longer than word or sentence items, these programs stress understanding and creative use of the language, rather than merely eliciting correct and automatic responses. Activities of this type are cloze passages, in which every n th word is missing and must be replaced; paragraphs in which sentences must be reordered (thus requiring understanding of the complete text); or stories containing erroneous or misplaced words that must be

> identified and changed. Students must not only understand the material but often, by completing it, actually contribute to its meaning (p. 180).

In that same article the authors state a final caveat, again underlining the inadequacy of even the newly proposed categorization: "In fact, the more elaborate CALL packages usually involve elements of more than one type of CALL activity. For example, there are software packages that begin with a tutorial, a short grammatical presentation interspersing questions to ensure comprehension. The presentation can include simulation if it shows graphically how the language works. A drill and practice exercise then allows the student to practice the grammatical concept with many examples. Finally the last part of the package is a contextualized activity or game that rewards quick recall" (pp. 181-82).

Computers are also used in several new ways, many of which are not traditional or adequately described by existing categories. For instance, computers are used to help students with writing skills; some software helps students organize thoughts (outline processors) and formulate and write down ideas ("idea processors"). A new rubric might describe this type of software more adequately: **skill-development software.**

Another major category of innovative software is the video-driven materials which simulate interactions with people, albeit people on film. This type of software may be classified as "simulation," but goes much beyond what "simulation" used to mean. One might term this type of materials **live action simulations.**

Hypertext, a concept that was elaborated in the '60s, is also making a significant impact on CALL-based activities. Much new software is being written that incorporates its characteristics. "The delivery of information in forms that go beyond traditional list and database report form..., [hypertext] links facts across conventional subject boundaries. For example, when studying chemistry, you may wish to study the life of a chemical compound's creator...[or else] you might connect the chemical compound to a listing of grocery store products that incorporate the compound, or to long-term health studies on the compound" (Goodman, 1987, p. xvii). Hypertext allows the user to access these parameters at will.

Although there presently exist few hypertext applications for CALL, one can foresee useful materials. For instance, a foreign language reading text presented on a computer might have links to information about the author, to a dictionary, or to comments about the cultural context (politics, life-styles, etc.), or even to comments about the meaning of the

text, to the gist of paragraphs, etc. If the hypertext concept is taken to the next logical step and incorporates other media stored on the computer, there could be links to a recording of the text, to graphics giving information about locales, conditions, etc., and even links to a video recording, showing the specific locale or even actors playing the roles described in the text. This extension of the hypertext concept, called **hypermedia**, is an important conceptual leap and is beginning to make an impact on the design of CALL software.

Attributes and Limitations

While it is easy to fall into a trap and to think of the computer as a wondrous machine embodying the solution to all problems, both real and imagined, computers do have their limitations, especially in their ability to teach foreign languages. For instance, they are incapable at this time of interacting with the user in a conversational oral way. Unless giant leaps are made in the field of voice recognition and output (and similar leaps in linguistics, including semantics and parsing), the computer will not be able to converse with the user in a free-form oral interchange in the near future. In line with current thought in L2 acquisition, free-form oral interchange between two people is a major goal of foreign language learning. It can be argued therefore, just as it has been argued that the book is an ineffective medium of instruction for foreign languages (see Schulz, this volume), that computers are ineffective as well. They do not address at all one of the major goals of foreign language learning: speaking.

Of the four skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing), which one(s) can the computer address? In what areas does it have attributes that would make it valuable in foreign language learning, particularly for multisectioned programs? In a recent article (1987) I discuss the relative capabilities of video, CALL, and text. I develop the chart below, modified here to take into account the latest advances in computer technology.

	Textbook	CALL	Video
Listening	-	+?	+
Speaking	-	-	-
Reading	+	+	+?
Writing	+?	+	-

Several things emerge from a scrutiny of this table. None of the three media addresses speaking specifically. However, it can be argued that a textbook does address speaking skills indirectly by providing activities and materials that will spark discussion. But texts do not directly

affect speaking skills. Neither does video or CALL. The only resource that can directly affect the teaching of speaking skills at the present time is interaction with a teacher (teacher-student interaction) or with other students (student-student interaction).

The **textbook** is primarily a medium for addressing written skills. It shines as a medium of presentation for reading materials. It is also used as a means to elicit written responses and to participate in written activities. The evaluation of the writing, however, is left up to a teacher or another evaluator. Hence the textbook is a good medium for presenting writing activities, but does not evaluate written production. (This is the reason a question mark follows the plus sign next to "Writing.")

CALL is a good medium for reading skills instruction as well. It should be pointed out, however, that recent research shows that people still prefer to read from a book rather than to read from a screen. Only very short messages (one or two screens long) are acceptable on a computer monitor.

With recent advances in digitizing speech on a computer, CALL adds an ability to present listening materials (an ability that the book does not possess). The technology, however, is still in its infancy; there are still some problems to solve, including a needed increase in storage capacity to make listening materials routinely available on computers. CALL can address writing as well. Many programs exist to help develop ideas, organize the essay, check spelling, check grammar, etc. Unfortunately, CALL cannot evaluate extended writing as would an instructor. However, the holistic suggestions that software can provide may be valuable.

Video has altogether different attributes. Like CALL, it can facilitate listening skills. It is especially suited for that skill since it can present not only audio material, but visual material as well, thus increasing motivation, adding realism, immediacy, and important nonverbal information to the communication. While video can also address reading skills, resolution of video images is still very poor and only a few characters may be displayed on a video screen. (A computer display, on the other hand, has more resolution.) One loses legibility very quickly with large numbers of characters. In any case, reading text from a video screen is tiring and not altogether practical.

It is plain to see that CALL, even though it does not address speaking skills, is still the most potentially useful medium for foreign language study of the three. It can address the most skills and, according to research, has other attributes as well.

Effectiveness

What evidence is there that CALL is an effective and efficient vehicle for language learning? Complete answers to those questions are not available. There are tantalizing bits of evidence from various sources that point to CALL (and to CAI, the more general form of CALL) as an effective and efficient medium of instruction, but longitudinal or long-term studies have not yet been done. Intermediate results are not conclusive.

What information we do have is interesting. For instance, in an extensive study of effectiveness of CAI (which includes all kinds of instruction such as mathematics, social science, etc.), Kulick, Kulick, and Cohen (1980) have shown that a certain measure of effectiveness comes from the use of computers in learning.

Kulick et al. began with a DIALOG (a bibliographic search and retrieval system) search of the literature available in 1980 about the results of studies that used computers to teach a wide variety of subjects. It should be noted that the studies dealt broadly with the use of computers in learning (CAI) and not specifically with CALL. Furthermore, since they were conducted in the 1970s (during the prehistory of CAI), they overwhelmingly concerned mainframe-based materials; none of the studies used microcomputers (which were made available in the late '70s). Although over 500 studies were identified, only 59 studies were retained because the others failed in some way to satisfy the researchers' criteria. Those retained reported on actual college-level classroom studies, used outcomes which were measured quantitatively, had control groups, did not include anecdotal evidence, and did not have apparent methodological flaws.

Kulick et al. went about analyzing the effectiveness of CAI from the evidence presented in the studies retained. The researchers were interested in the impact of CAI in several different categories. They examined student achievement, or how well students performed with CAI vs. with regular classes. They were also interested in aptitude vs. achievement. They looked at the rate of course completion in CAI vs. in a regular class. They further assessed student attitude toward the subject matter. Finally, they measured total instructional time in both the CAI class and in the normal class.

It should be noted that the researchers undertook a "meta-analysis" of findings; that is, they merely reported the results obtained in other research experiments. Kulick et al. do not report on the specific methods used in each study, but on an analysis of the results, collectively. They refer the reader to the individual study for specifics. I shall do the same.

The results nevertheless were surprising:

Student Achievement: CAI has a small positive effect. The average examination score for students in classes using CAI for a part of the instruction was 60.6%, while students in a conventional class achieved on the average 57.6% on their examinations. The effect of CAI in a typical class was to raise student achievement by about one-quarter of a standard deviation unit.

Aptitude vs. Achievement: CAI has a small positive effect on the correlation between aptitude and achievement in college courses.

Course Completion: No effect. Students in normal classes were as likely to complete the course as students in CAI classes. Average CAI class withdrawal was 26.9%, while in conventional classes it was 27.6%.

Student Attitude: CAI has a small positive effect on students' overall attitude toward instruction in CAI and conventional classes. Four studies showed a statistically reliable difference in favor of CAI, while one study favored conventional teaching. Furthermore, CAI has a small positive effect on the students' attitude toward the subject matter being studied. In five studies CAI classes had more favorable attitudes toward the subject, while in two studies students in conventional classes expressed a more favorable attitude.

Instructional Time: There was a significant time savings in the CAI class vs. the regular class. What took on the average 3.5 hours in a regular class took 2.25 hours in a CAI class. "There appears to be little doubt that students can be taught with computers in less time than with conventional methods of college teaching" (p. 537).

While not overwhelmingly positive, the results shown by Kulick et al. are encouraging and do point to CAI as a viable medium of instruction. However, the results are not entirely applicable to CALL since they were based on data for general classes, and not language classes. Questions still remain about the efficacity of CALL. Also still debatable is the importance of CALL in the context of large numbers of classes with multisectioned courses and diverse staff (teaching assistants, adjuncts, and faculty). Can CALL make a difference?

Unfortunately, there are few objective or longitudinal studies on the effectiveness of CALL. We do have some tantalizing bits, however. For instance, Robinson (1989) reports that on the whole, CALL classes show

a marked improvement in achievement when compared with regular classes. She thus replicates Kulick's results on achievement. Robinson's study further suggests that an integrated approach to materials may be the most effective way to present CALL or, for that matter, any material.

> In organizing material for CALL (or textbook) lesson presentation, language learning materials may be more effective, over time, when presented and practiced within an *integrated context* in which students' attention is focused on the *meaning* of the material and language is used to *draw inferences* as in *solving a problem*. Material may be more meaningful when students *relate personally* to it, either because the materials contain *reference to themselves* or to *people they know*, because it is amusing or otherwise *emotionally appealing*, and because they *select it (from a menu)* out of *personal interest*. While these features did not appear to have any *immediate* effect on second-language learning in this study, their *cumulative* effect is noteworthy and merits further investigation (p. 131).

Robinson addresses an area which was completely ignored by Kulick et al., namely, the factor of quality. Nowhere in the criteria for selection of studies in the Kulick et al. metastudy did a criterion for quality appear. In other words, whatever gains were demonstrated about the effectiveness of computer materials, they referred to the medium and not to the quality of the materials. This effectively makes the gains for the CAI classes more impressive: if learning improvements can be shown with CAI materials whose quality has not been measured, more impressive results could probably be shown with well-designed CAI or CALL materials.

Similarly, Rivers (1989) suggests that "the most pedagogically sophisticated courseware producers have turned their attention to creative and exploratory interaction with the computer which seizes students' attention and involves them with reception and production of language because of the intrinsic interest of the evolving situation." In other words, while CALL may be an interesting medium through which to present language materials, one ought to pay particular attention to the content and design strategy of the materials, for they too can play a crucial role in the students' motivation and learning.

What about the impact on multisection courses? While no studies specifically deal with CALL in multisection courses, there are a few things that can be inferred from what we already know. Multisection courses are typically taught by diverse staff (teaching assistants, adjuncts, and faculty). Staff diversity is both a blessing (it provides students with a variety of teaching styles and emphases) and a problem (it is hard to

keep all sections roughly on the same track). CALL's attributes seem exactly suited for the multisection course since the medium provides a standard, stable set of core materials to be used by all students in the class. (Note that there are no reports of completely computerized modern language courses, nor should there be.) The staff would be assured that all students have access to the same set of materials and could take advantage of time savings afforded by CALL. The supervisor would also be assured that some measure of standardization is occurring across the sections both in materials covered and, to some extent, in the quality of coverage.

Of course, another important factor in teaching multisection courses is time. Much of the planning work that goes into supervising a multisection course is devoted to matters of saving time or of making efficient use of the time. The instructional staff, the teaching assistants, must devote much or most of their time to their graduate studies; their teaching duties must therefore be carried out efficiently. Once again, CALL can make a real impact since, according to the results of the meta-analysis of Kulick et al, computers can save instructional time. What takes on the average 3.5 hours in a regular class takes 2.25 hours in a class that uses computers for some of the instruction. CALL can both save instructional time for students and afford flexibility in the use of time for instructors.

Finally, we should ask what role the new hardware will play in shaping further the type of CALL interactions in the next few years. What trends can be detected in the hardware?

What's Coming?

New features are appearing on computers almost daily. The industry is willing and able to provide more of everything, for a price, of course. Speed and capacity of microcomputers are doubling every few years. We are now able to purchase displays with extremely high resolutions and with several million shades of color. We have computing speeds 33 times faster than the original Apple II, storage devices with about 5000 times larger capacities than single-sided floppies, sound-digitizing capabilities that are as good as audio compact discs, and very sophisticated programs to do everything from teaching Russian to doing taxes. And yet, our appetite for more of everything goes unsated.

One of the most interesting developments that has come out of the laboratories of the hardware gurus is the CD-ROM. (For a thorough description of the hardware and software implications, see Lambert and Ropiequet, 1986. For a CALL perspective, see Woodbury, 1988.) It is a device which can store an incredible amount of information, and, by

itself, may be very significant indeed. But it is the type of information that can be stored on CD-ROM that makes it very exciting for CALL. It appears that the CD-ROM is a kind of universal storage device for all manner of information, including graphics of all kinds (in color), programming information, digitized sound (of very high fidelity), and eventually even color video. One such disc holds enough information to be practical for distribution of very sophisticated courseware. It is possible to consider that in one of the discs a whole semester's worth of multimedia instruction could be stored. And, in quantities, that disc would cost only a dollar or two to produce (for the disc itself, and not for the software it contains). The impact the CD-ROM will have on all of the audiovisual devices found in schools (language laboratory carrels, slide projectors, video players, overhead projectors, etc.) will be significant since the CD-ROM has the potential to replace all of them.

Where to Begin?

Not having a firm idea of what to do or where to start, the reader is probably deep into a state of confusion. There are just too many options, too many things to think about, and too few support dollars. It is painfully clear that introducing computers in academe is expensive. It is also clear that, since computers have been getting cheaper every year, one can wait just another year and purchase them for several hundreds of dollars less. Therefore it is understandable that one of the most popular reactions is to do nothing. One merely waits until computers get more powerful and cheaper. Unfortunately, that solution is probably the costliest of all. Computers do help; they do save time; they are efficient. And waiting will simply postpone becoming efficient.

What to do? I would like to propose a plan of action, a series of plausible steps to take. The first thing to do is to get ONE computer (and printer) for exclusive use by the staff. (Note that computers available at a learning center are no substitute. Exclusive use is essential.) This, in itself, will not solve many problems but it will do two things: 1) It will get the staff of the multisection courses on a learning curve. They will shed their apprehension about computers, about how "difficult" they are to use; and 2) It will get them started thinking about using computers in support of teaching. They will probably start small by putting exams and quizzes on the machine (see the section entitled "Support Materials" for sources of software). The process will be laborious at first, but then there will be a great benefit when the tests are printed virtually error-free. Then there will be another great benefit when similar exams must be given the succeeding semester and the ones on diskette become the basis for new exams. Then the staff will probably want to use the

machines for other management tasks such as grade keeping. They may then use the machines for preparing handouts, notes, review materials, and announcements. Experimentation with educational software comes next. Some of the software will probably come from the public domain, some from academic sources, and then some will eventually be designed by the staff using authoring systems. By this time, there will probably be a need for a second machine, as the original one is becoming heavily used, not only by the staff, but also by students using software experimentally. Eventually, other machines may need to be added, this time in support of students' learning.

The process will take some time, but is predictable. As the benefits of the computer are felt on the curriculum, more will be needed. However, the journey starts with a single step: the acquisition of the first machine exclusively devoted to curricular development.

In some departments computers are available and are routinely used for word processing for faculty. Generally though, no systematic curricular use is made of those machines. To improve the situation, one computer ought to be devoted to curricular use and made available exclusively for it. Teaching assistants, adjunct faculty, and other support staff ought to think of that machine as their very own. Furthermore, "expert" users ought to be encouraged to tell how they are using their machines and to demonstrate their applications. Training facilities should be identified on campus and people should take advantage of them. Often people are reticent to use computers, not so much because it is a "difficult" thing to do, but because of their innate fear of the unfamiliar and new. Demystifying computers by making them a common and accessible commodity will go a long way in dispelling people's emotional reaction to them.

Works Cited

Ariew, Robert. "Integrating Video and CALL in the Curriculum." *Modern Media in Foreign Language Education: Theory and Implementation*. Ed. W. Flint Smith. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company, 1987: 41-66.

——— & Judith Frommer. "Interaction in the Computer Age." *Interactive Language Teaching*. Ed. Wilga M. Rivers. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987: 177-93.

Clark, John L. D. "Toward a Research and Development Strategy for Computer Assisted Language Learning." *CALICO Journal* 5, iii (1988): 5-23.

Goodman, Danny. *The Complete Hypercard Handbook*. New York: Bantam Books, 1987.

Hope, Geoffrey, Heimy Taylor & James. Pusak. *Using Computers in Teaching Foreign Languages*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1984.

Jaffe, Conrade C. & Patrick J. Lynch. "Hypermedia for Education in the Life Sciences." *Academic Computing* 4, i (1989): 10-13; 52-57.

Jones, Christopher & Sue Fortescue. *Using Computers in the Language Classroom*. London: Longmans, 1987.

Kulick, James A., Chen-Lin C. Kulick & Peter A. Cohen. "Effectiveness of Computer-based College Teaching: A Meta-analysis of Findings." *Review of Educational Research* 50 (1980): 525-44.

Lambert, Steve & Suzanne Ropiequet. *CD ROM: The New Papyrus*. Redmond, WA: Microsoft Press, 1986.

Rivers, Wilga. "Interaction and Communication in the Language Class in an Age of Technology." *Language Teaching, Testing, and Technology: Lessons from the Past with a View Toward the Future*. Georgetown University Round Table on Language and Linguistics. Ed. James E. Alatis. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1989: 186-97.

Robinson, Gail. "The CLCCS CALL Study: Methods, Error Feedback, Attitudes and Achievement." *Modern Technology in Foreign Language Education: Application and Projects*. Ed. W. Flint Smith. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company, 1989: 119-34.

Smith, W. Flint. *Modern Technology in Foreign Language Education: Applications and Projects*. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company, 1989.

Woodbury, Verl. "CD-ROM: Potential and Practicalities." *CALICO Journal* 6, i (1988): 25-35.

Young, Richard. "Computer-Assisted Language Learning Conversations: Negotiating an Outcome. *CALICO Journal* 5, iii (1988): 65-83.

Support Materials

Selected Publications

Academic Computing, news and projects in higher education, Academic Computing, PO Box 804, McKinney, TX 75069.

ALLC Bulletin, a journal of the Association for Literary and Linguistic Computing, J. L. Dawson, Literary and Linguistic Computing Centre, Sidgwick Site, Cambridge, CB3 9DA, United Kingdom.

CALICO Journal, journal of the Computer Assisted Language Learning and Instruction Consortium, specializing in foreign language learning with computers, CALICO, 3078 JKHB, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT 84602.

Collegiate Microcomputer, specializes in uses of computers in higher education with an emphasis on uses in writing and composition, Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology, Terre Haute, IN 47803.

Computers and Education, an international journal focusing on education, Pergamon Press, Maxwell House, Fairview Park, Elmsford, NY 10523.

Computers and the Humanities, a generalist journal with some emphasis on literary studies, Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, PO Box 358, Accord Station, Hingham, MA 02018.

Educational Computer Magazine, deals principally with secondary education, Educational Computer, PO Box 535, Cupertino, CA 95015.

edu Magazine, college-level news and projects using Digital Equipment Corporation equipment, Digital Equipment Corporation, Three Results Way, MR03-2/E7, Marlboro, MA 01752.

Journal of Computer-Based Instruction, Journal of the Association for the Development of Computer-Based Instructional Systems, educational research orientation, ADCIS International Headquarters, Miller Hall 409, Western Washington University, Bellingham, WA 98225.

System, an international journal of educational technology and applied linguistics, Pergamon Journals, Maxwell House, Fairview Park, Elmsford, NY 10523.

Wheels for the Mind, an Apple University publication prepared at Boston College, news and projects using Apple equipment, Apple Computer, PO Box 1834, Escondido, CA 92025.

Authoring Systems

MS DOS Systems (IBM and "clones")

McGraw-Hill Authoring System, a complete interactive authoring system. Includes ability to present text and graphics in color. Will generate multiple choice, fill-in-the-blanks, and matching screens. Also includes simulation capabilities. McGraw-Hill Co., 1221 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10020.

MicroTICCIT, authoring system for generating computer assisted instruction materials. Includes the ability to present text and full-color graphics as well as video/computer-generated graphics on the same

screen, automatic recording of student data. Also includes a comprehensive, easy-to-learn computer language. Hazeltine Corporation, 7680 Old Springhouse Road, McLean, VA 22102.

Quest, free-form authoring medium for generating computer-assisted instruction materials. Includes the ability to present text as well as color graphics, video. Student answers may be true/false, multiple choice, fill-in-the-blanks format, free-form question/answer capability. Includes branching capability as well as student record keeping. Allen Communication, 140 Lakeside Plaza II, 52235 Wiley Post Way, Salt Lake City, UT 84116.

TenCORE, a flexible authoring system which includes the ability to display text and graphics in several resolutions. Includes the ability to display video, mouse, light pen, touch panel input, audio. The system includes its own programming language which provides complete recordkeeping, test generation, and prescription facilities. Computer Teaching Corporation, 1713 S. Neil Street, Champaign, IL 61820.

Macintosh Systems

Authorware Academic, an object-oriented development system, includes ability to use graphics, mouse, text in multiple sizes and styles, animation, pulldown menus, can also export software to the MS DOS environment, Authorware Inc., 8500 Normandale Lake Boulevard, Ninth Floor, Minneapolis, MN 55437.

Course Builder, an object-oriented development system, includes ability to use graphics, mouse, text in multiple sizes and styles, animation, pulldown menus, digitized and synthesized voice, video. TeleRobotics International Inc., 8410 Oak Ridge Highway, Knoxville, TN 37931.

Guide, a hypertext authoring tool, includes ability to use mouse, pulldown menus, graphics, branching, videodisc and CD-ROM. Owl International, 14218 Northeast 21st Street, Bellevue, WA 98007.

Hypercard, a general purpose hypertext authoring system, includes ability to use mouse, pulldown menus, graphics, digitized sounds, video, branching, searching and programming capabilities. Included with every Apple Macintosh.

SuperCard, a general purpose hypertext authoring system, includes ability to use mouse, pulldown menus, color graphics, digitized sounds,

video, branching, resizable windows, full-screen support, searching and programming capabilities using built-in programming language. Silicon Beach Software, 9770 Carroll Center Road, Suite J, San Diego, CA 92126.

VideoWorks Interactive, a graphics and animation package for designing simulations. Also allows the use of video, digitized and synthesized sound. Includes a programming language similar to BASIC. MacroMind Inc., 1028 West Wolfram, Chicago, IL 60657.

Selected Software Distributors

Bureau of Electronic Publishing, PO Box 779, Upper Montclair, NJ 07043. Software and data available on CD-ROM. For MS DOS and Macintosh computers.

Chariot Software Group, 3659 India Street, Suite 100c, San Diego, CA 92103. Macintosh software.

Conduit Catalog of Educational Software, Oakdale Campus, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA 52242. Secondary- and college-level software.

Gessler Educational Software, 900 Broadway, New York, NY 10003. Apple II and secondary-level software for foreign languages.

Kinko's Academic Courseware Exchange, 4141 State Street, Santa Barbara, CA 93110. Macintosh and Apple II software, written by academics.

National Collegiate Software Clearing House, Duke University Press, 6697 College Station, Durham, NC 27708. Software for the humanities and social sciences.

Tools for Learning, Courseware Catalog, IBM Academic Information Systems, 472 Wheelers Farms Road, Milford, CT 06460. College-level software for the IBM PC and compatible computers. Materials available for all disciplines, written by academics.

Wisc-Ware, Academic Computing Center, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1210 West Dayton Street, Madison, WI 53706. Research and instructional software for MS DOS computers. Software written by academics.

The Preparation and Support of Graduate Teaching Assistants in Foreign Languages: A Bibliography

David P. Benseler and Christine Cronjaeger
Ohio State University

Every professional organization worthy of the name needs its own database. The absence of an easily locatable record of previous research and commentary in a given discipline forces scholars to repeat the work—and sometimes even the mistakes—of the past, if their knowledge and understanding are to mature.

The publication of the first volume of the series *Issues in Language Program Direction*, the yearbook of the American Association of University Supervisors, Coordinators, and Directors of Foreign Language Programs (AAUSC), provides a most propitious opportunity to assemble in one place a record of the ideas of the immediate and distant past and to plan a research agenda for the future. To those ends we offer the bibliography given below.

The present compilation has evolved over the past several years, includes an electronic search of the ERIC system, and incorporates *published* scholarship located through April of 1990. Because opinion and research findings concerning the preparation and support of graduate teaching assistants are not necessarily discipline-specific, entries are included from scholars based in a variety of academic areas—the humanities, the social sciences, and the sciences. Also included are occasional newspaper articles devoted to teaching assistants, more specifically to their economic status. A comprehensive survey on the status,

preparation, and working conditions of language teachers by Peter A. Eddy is included for its value as background material for continuing research, although it does not focus on TA development.

At the same time, we have excluded from the compilation all *unpublished* scholarship (e.g. papers read at conferences and symposia, even if listed in the ERIC database) and scholarship that is devoted primarily to the education of foreign language teachers in general, unless it focused specifically on college and university language programs. Excluded as well are listings devoted to the preparation of undergraduate teaching assistants, teaching guides, and "handbooks" outlining a particular department's or institution's development program for new and/or returning teaching assistants.

Entries are listed alphabetically by the last name of the first or sole author. Those entries without authors are alphabetized by the first word of the title. Editors' names appear after the title of the edited work. With one exception the contents of edited volumes devoted entirely to TA development are completely indexed in the bibliography. The exception is the volume entitled *The Teaching Apprentice Program in Language and Literature*, edited by Gibaldi and Mirollo, since it consists primarily of descriptions of TA development programs at various institutions. In order for the compilation below to be as self-contained as possible, the complete contents of the present volume have been integrated into it.

Despite the care with which the bibliography has been compiled, it should be regarded as but a step in the establishment of a database focusing on the improvement of college and university language programs, in general, and of the preparation and support of teaching assistants in particular. One would hope that each future volume of *Issues in Language Program Direction* would devote a chapter to significant research results from the previous year.

Bibliography

Abbott, Robert D., Donald H. Wulff & C. Kati Szego. "Review of Research on TA Training." *Teaching Assistant Training in the 1990s* [see below]: 111-24.

Abbott, Suzanne & Ralph M. Carter. "Clinical Supervision and the Foreign Language Teacher." *Foreign Language Annals* 18 (1975): 25-29.

Allen, R. R. & Theodore Rueter. *Teaching Assistant Strategies: An Introduction to College Teaching*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall-Hunt, 1989.

Allen, Robert D. "Effective Training for Teaching Assistants." *American Biology Teacher* 38, i (1976): 24-27.

Altman, Howard B. "Training and Retraining the University Foreign Language Professor: Goals, Problems, Prospects." *ADFL Bulletin* 11, ii (1979): 32-36.

———. "TA Training at the University of Louisville: Creating a Climate." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see below]: 174-76.

Aminmansour, Abbas. "A Teaching Assistant's Perspective [on Training TAs]." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see below]: 25-27.

Anderson, John F. & Douglas R. Berdie. "A Recent Study of Graduate Assistants." *Research in Higher Education* 4, ii (1976): 177-83.

Andrews, John D. W. "Teaching Format and Student Style: Their Interactive Effects on Learning." *Research in Higher Education* 14 (1981): 161-78.

———. "The Process of Launching a TA Development Program." *Strengthening the Teaching Assistant Faculty* [see below]: 75-81.

———. "Why TA Training Needs Instructional Innovation." *Strengthening the Teaching Assistant Faculty* [see below]: 47-62.

———. "A Developer's Perspective. Teaching in Higher Education: From Hobby to Profession." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see below]: 19-22.

———. "Department-Based and Centralized TA Training Programs." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see below]: 109-10.

Andrews, P. H. "Creating a Supportive Climate for Teacher Growth: Developing Graduate Students as Teachers." *Communication Quarterly* 31 (1983): 259-65.

Angelo, Thomas & K. Patricia Cross. "Classroom Research for Teaching Assistants." *Teaching Assistant Training in the 1990s* [see below]: 99-108.

Ard, Josh. "The Foreign TA Problem from an Acquisition-Theoretic Point of View." *ESP Journal* 6 (1987): 133-44.

Ariew, Robert. "CALL Today: Implications for Multisectioned Language Programs." *Challenges in the 1990s* [see below]: 183–205.

Armenti, Angelo, Jr. & Gerald F. Wheeler. "Hawthorne Effect and Quality Teaching: Training Graduate Teaching Assistants to Teach." *American Journal of Physics* 46 (1978): 121-24.

Aronson, J. Richard. "Six Keys to Effective Instruction in Large Classes: Advice from a Practitioner." *Teaching Large Classes Well* [see below]: 31-37.

Avens, J. S. "Teaching-Students-Learning." *NACTA Journal* 24 (1980): 15-16.

Azevedo, Milton M. "Preservice Training for Graduate Teaching Assistants." *Modern Language Journal* 60 (1976): 254-58.

Bailey, Judy G. "TA Handbooks: What Should They Include?" *Institutional Responsibilities* [see below]: 136-39.

Bailey, Leona G. "An Analysis of the Use of Videotape Recorders in the Training of College Level Foreign Language Teachers." *ADFL Bulletin* 5, iii (1974): 42-43.

————. "Observing Foreign Language Teaching: A New Method for Teachers, Researchers, and Supervisors." *Foreign Language Annals* 10 (1977): 641-48.

————. "Teacher Education for A Changing World." *The Language Connection: From the Classroom to the World*. The ACTFL Foreign Language Education Series. Ed. June K. Phillips. Skokie, IL: National Textbook Company, 1977: 179-210 [see esp. pp. 194-200].

Baird, Hugh, et al. "Teacher Education 1984." *Proceedings of the Utah Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters* 44, i (1967): 214-23.

Baker, Marilyn J. "Grievances and Taxes." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see below]: 49-52.

Banta, Frank G. "Graduate to Graduate: Practice Teaching for Advanced Instruction." *Die Unterrichtspraxis* 2, i (1969): 44-46.

Barbour, James, et al. "1983-84 Salaries for Teaching Assistants in English Departments." *ADE Bulletin* no. 78 (1984): 45-50.

Barnes, Betsy K., Carol A. Klee & Ray M. Wakefield. "Reconsidering the Foreign Language Requirement: From Seat-Time to Proficiency in the Minnesota Experience." *Challenges in the 1990s* [see below]: 55-70.

Barnett, Marva A. "Peer Observation and Analysis: Improving Teaching and Training TAs." *ADFL Bulletin* 15, i (1983): 30-33.

Barrus, J. L., et al. "Preparing Teaching Assistants." *Journal of College Science Teaching* 3, v (1974): 350-52.

Baslaw, Annette S., Joan Freilich, et al. "Training for Student-Centered Language Programs." *Toward Student-Centered Foreign-Language Programs*. Northeast Conference Reports. Ed. Warren C. Born. [Middlebury, VT]: Northeast Conference, 1974: 15-72 [see esp. pp. 26-28].

Benseler, David P. & Christine Cronjaeger. "The Preparation and Support of Graduate Teaching Assistants in Foreign Languages: A Bibliography." *Challenges in the 1990s* [see below]: 207–32.

———— & Renate A. Schulz. "Methodological Trends in College Foreign Language Instruction. "*Modern Language Journal* 64 (1980): 88-96.

Berdie, Douglas R., et al. "Improving the Effectiveness of Teaching Assistants—Undergraduates Speak Out." *Improving College and University Teaching* 24 (1976): 169-71.

Berwald, Jean-Pierre. "Training Graduate Assistants in Foreign Languages." *Designs for Foreign Language Teacher Education*. Ed. Alan Garfinkel & Stanley Hamilton. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1976: 73-86.

Boehrer, John. "Suggestions for Watching Tapes with TAs." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see below]: 134-35.

———— & Ellen Sarkisian. "The Teaching Assistant's Point of View." *Strengthening the Teaching Assistant Faculty* [see below]: 7-20.

Bognanno, Mario F. & Edward L. Suntrup. "Graduate Assistants' Response to Unionization: The Minnesota Experience." *Labor Law Journal* 27, i (1976): 32-37.

Bonge, Dennis. "Using TA Ratings to Validate Student Evaluations: A Reply to Lamberth and Kosteski." *Teaching of Psychology* 9 (1982): 102.

Border, Laura. "Producing a TA Newsletter." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see below]: 140-43.

Bos, Ronald R., D. B. Zakrajsek, W. Wolf & S. Stoll. "Teaching Assistants' Traits: Their Influence on Student Ratings." *Improving College and University Teaching* 28 (1980): 179-85.

Braddock, Richard. "Reversing the Peter Principle to Help Inexperienced Graduate Assistants Teach Freshman Rhetoric." *College English* 32, i (1970): 45-49.

————. "Comparing Stipends of Teaching Assistants." *Freshman English News* 1, i (1972): 3.

Braskamp, Larry A., et al. "Student Ratings and Instructor Self-Ratings and Their Relationship to Student Achievement." *American Educational Research Journal* 16 (1979): 295-306.

Braun, Theodore E. D. & Bonnie Robb. "Team Teaching French with Teaching Assistants." *Challenges in the 1990s* [see below]: 71–88.

Bray, James H. & George S. Howard. "Methodological Considerations in the Evaluation of a Teacher-Training Program." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 72 (1980): 62-70.

Brinko, Kate, John Habel & Billiee Pendleton-Parker. "Formative Feedback from Peers." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see below]: 193-207.

Brooks, David W., et al. "An Introduction to Teaching Techniques for Graduate Laboratory Instructors." *Journal of Chemical Education* 49 (1972): 622-23.

————, et al. "The Teaching Coach: A Means of Enhancing Student-Teaching Assistant Interactions During Recitations." *Journal of Chemical Education* 53 (1976): 186-87.

————, et al. "Student Evaluation versus Faculty Evaluation of Chemistry Teaching Assistants." *Journal of Chemical Education* 57 (1980): 294-95.

Brumfit, Christopher. "The Integration of Theory and Practice." *Applied Linguistics and the Preparation of Second Language Teachers: Towards a Rationale.* Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics. Ed. James Alatis, H. H. Stern & Peter Strevens. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1983: 59-73.

Buckenmeyer, James A. "Preparing Graduate Assistants to Teach." *Improving College and University Teaching* 20 (1972): 142-44.

Buehler, George. "The Videotape Recorder: An Indispensable Tool for TA Training." *Die Unterrichtspraxis* 9, ii (1976): 94-97.

Byrd, Patricia. "Training International Teaching Assistants: Policy and Procedure." *Journal of International Student Personnel* 2, ii (1985): 1-4.

———. "Being Seduced by Face Validity: Linguistic and Administrative Issues in Videotaped Teaching Simulation Testing." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see below]: 355-57.

——— & Janet Constantinides. "Foreign TA Training Programs: Searching for Appropriate Teaching Styles." *English for Specific Purposes* 7 (1988): 123-29.

Caldwell, E. C., et al. "Mastery: The Essential Essential in PSI." *Teaching of Psychology* 5, ii (1978): 59-65.

Cameron-Bacon, Susan M. "Using the Student Assistant in Individualized Foreign-Language Instruction." *Foreign Language Annals* 7 (1974): 353-56.

Carlson, Charles E. "A Negotiator's Perspective [on Teaching Assistant Collective Bargaining at the University of Wisconsin, Madison]." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see below]: 60-64.

Carrell, Patricia, Susanne Sarwark & Barbara Plakans. "Innovative ITA Screening Techniques." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see below]: 351-54.

Carrithers, Gale H., Jr. "Teaching Assistant Stipends in English Departments." *ADE Bulletin* no. 71 (1982): 40-41.

Carroll, J. Gregory. "Assessing the Effectiveness of a Training Program for the University Teaching Assistants." *Teaching of Psychology* 4, iii (1977): 135-38.

———. "Effects of Training Programs for University Teaching Assistants: A Review of Empirical Research." *Journal of Higher Education* 51 (1980): 167-83.

Carton, Aaron S. "The Case for Language Education Specialists." *AAALetter: The Newsletter of the American Association for Applied Linguists* 8, i (1986): 4-6.

Cazort, Douglas. "Advice from a Recent Has-Been to a TA Starting Cold." *Freshman English News* 10 (1982): 1-4.

Challenges in the 1990s for Foreign Language Programs. Issues in Language Program Direction. Ed. Sally Sieloff Magnan. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle, 1990.

Chang, Alice F., et al. "The Relationship of Student Self-Esteem and Teacher Empathy to Classroom Learning." *Psychology: A Quarterly Journal of Human Behavior* 18 (1981): 21-25.

Chase, John L. *Graduate Teaching Assistants in American Universities: A Review of Recent Trends and Recommendations.* Washington, DC: National Center for

Education Research & Development, Division of Higher Education Research, 1970 [Rept. OE-58039].

Cheatham, Richard & William J. Jordan. "An Investigation of Graduate Assistants in Teaching the College Public Speaking Course." *Speech Teacher* 21, ii (1972): 107-14.

Chism, Nancy Van Note. "The Teaching Assistantship: An Overview." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see below]: 1-3, 33-34, 65-66, 126-28, 249-50, 358-59.

————, Jamie Cano & Anne S. Pruitt. "Teaching in a Diverse Environment: Knowledge and Skills Needed by TAs." *Teaching Assistant Training in the 1990s* [see below]: 23-36.

Clark, M. A. "What Do We Owe to the Gurus?" *TESOL Quarterly* 18 (1984): 577-94.

Cohen, Andrew D. "Error Correction and the Training of Foreign Language Teachers." *Modern Language Journal* 59 (1975): 414-22.

Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC). "Resolution on Language Program Coordinators." *Hispania* 69 (1986): 332; rpt. *Modern Language Journal* 70 (1986): 161; "Language Administrators Approve Resolution." *French Review* 60 (1987): 676.

Conn, Peter. "Combining Literature and Composition: English 886." *ADE Bulletin* no. 72 (1982): 4-6.

Constantinides, Janet C. "Designing a Training Program for International Teaching Assistants." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see below]: 275-83.

————. "ITA Training Programs." *Teaching Assistant Training in the 1990s* [see below]: 71-77.

Constantino, Magdalena. "Intercultural Communication for International Teaching Assistants: Observations on Theory, Pedagogy, and Research." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see below]: 290-300.

Craig, Judith S. "University-Level Policies for TAs: Experience at the University of Wisconsin." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see below]: 38-43.

————. "An Administrator's Perspective [on Teaching Assistant Collective Bargaining at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.]" *Institutional Responsibilities* [see below]: 53-60.

Crooks, Terence J. "An Evaluation of a Program for Developing Teaching Skills." *Journal of Educational Technology Systems* 9 (1980): 95-122.

D'Antonio, William V. & Hugh F. Lena. "Preparing Graduate Students to Teach: An Ongoing Experiment in a Small-Class Setting." *Teaching Sociology* 3 (1976): 277-88.

Dalbor, John. "A Realistic Look at the Training of College Foreign Language Teachers." *Modern Language Journal* 51 (1967): 209-14.

Dalgaard, Kathleen Albrecht. "Some Effects of Training on Teacher Effectiveness of Untrained University Teaching Assistants." Diss., University of Illinois, 1976.

Damarin, Suzanne & Gregory West. "Preparation of Foreign Graduate Students to Teach Mathematics: An Experimental Course." *American Mathematical Monthly* 86 (1979): 494-97.

Dannerbeck, Francis J. "Toward a Methods Course Requirement at the Graduate Level." *Modern Language Journal* 50 (1966): 273-74.

Darling, Ann L. "TA Socialization: A Communication Perspective." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see below]: 91-94.

Davey, Kathleen B. & Curt Marion. "Evaluating TA Development Programs: Problems, Issues, Strategies." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see below]: 118-25.

Davis, B. K. "A Study of the Effectiveness of Training for Foreign Teaching Assistants." Diss., Ohio State University, 1984.

Davis, Bertram H. "Report of Committee A, 1979-1980." *Academe* 66 (1980): 251-59.

Davis, Brian. "The Effectiveness of Videotaped Protocols as a Training Technique for International TAs." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see below]: 321-33.

Davis, William E. "TA Training: Professional Development for Future Faculty." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see below]: 129-31.

DeBoer, Kathryn B. "Teacher Preparation for Graduate Assistants." *Communication Education* 28 (1979): 328-31.

DeLorenzo, William E., et al. "New Teachers: Developing Flexible Foreign Language Teachers." *New Contents. New Teachers. New Publics.* Northeast Conference Reports. Ed. Warren C. Born. [Middlebury, VT]: Northeast Conference, 1978: 64-115 [see esp. pp. 83-84].

Derounian, Kathryn Zabelle. "From Graduate Assistant to Assistant Professor: Promotion in Composition Teaching Skills?" *Freshman English News* 10 (1982): 19-20.

Diamond, Robert M. "A National Study of Teaching Assistants." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see below]: 80-82.

——— & Peter I. Gray. *National Study of Teaching Assistants.* Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Center for Instructional Development, 1987.

DiDonato, Robert. "TA Training and Supervision: A Checklist for an Effective Program." *ADFL Bulletin* 15, i (1983): 34-36.

Diogenes, Marvin, et al. "Creating the Profession: The GAT Training Program at the University of Arizona." *Writing Program Administration Journal* 10 (1986): 51-60.

Dixon, John R. "Limit Enrollment—Or Seek Alternatives?" *Engineering Education* 74 (1983): 84-85.

"Doctoral Training for the Expanded Undergraduate Curriculum: Resolutions of the 1975 ADFL Summer Seminar." *ADFL Bulletin* 7, i (1975): 17-20.

Donahue, Frank E. "A Texas Model for TA Training." *Die Unterrichtspraxis* 13 (1980): 141-49.

Dunkel, Patricia A. & Tannaz Rahman. "Developing Listening and Speech Communication Skills: A Course for Prospective International Teaching Assistants." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see below]: 301-06.

Dvorak, Trisha. "The Ivory Ghetto: The Place of the Language Program Coordinator in a Research Institution." *Hispania* 69 (1986): 217-22.

Eadie, William F. "A National Conference on Teaching Assistants: A Department Chair's Response." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see below]: 372-74.

Eble, Kenneth. *The Craft of Teaching: A Guide to Mastering the Professor's Art*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1981.

———. "Defending the Indefensible." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see below]: 7-13.

Eck, John S. "Screening International TAs for Oral English Proficiency." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see below]: 348-50.

Eddy, Frederick D. "Staffing Foreign Language Departments in Colleges and Universities: A Tentative Draft for Teaching and Professional Service." *ADFL Bulletin* 6, i (1974): 31-37.

Eddy, Peter A. "Present Status of Foreign Language Teaching: A Northeast Conference Survey." *Our Profession: Present Status and Future Directions.* Northeast Conference Reports. Ed. Thomas H. Geno. [Middlebury, VT]: Northeast Conference, 1980: 13-59.

Englert, DuWayne C., et al. "Evaluation Techniques for Individualized Instruction: Revision and Summative Evaluation." *Journal of Educational Technology Systems* 15 (1987): 191-200.

"Enrollment, Stipends, and Degrees at 239 Graduate Schools, Fall 1984." *Chronicle of Higher Education* (13 February 1985): 3.

Ervin, Gerard L. "The Role of the Language Teaching Specialist in the College Foreign Language Department." *ADFL Bulletin* 7, ii (1975): 15-16.

———. "A Training Program for New TAs in Russian." *Russian Language Journal* 35 (1981): 27-33.

———— & Judith A. Muyskens. "On Training TAs: Do We Know What They Want and Need?" *Foreign Language Annals* 15 (1982): 335-44.

Estabrook, Marina, et al. *Teaching Assistants: A History and a Survey Study*. Davis, CA: University of California, Davis, 1979.

Ewens, Bill, et al. *Preparing Graduate Students to Teach: A Selected, Annotated Bibliography*. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association, 1977.

Farris, Christine. "Helping TAs Respond to Student Writing." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see below]: 187-92.

Feldman, David M. "A Model Design for the In-Service Training of Foreign Language Teachers." *Advances in the Teaching of Modern Languages*. Ed. Gustave Mathieu. New York: Pergamon, 1966: 173-82.

Fernald, Peter S., et al. "Systematic Manipulation of Student Pacing, Perfection Requirement, and Contact with a Teaching Assistant in an Introductory Psychology Course." *Teaching of Psychology* 2, iv (1975): 147-51.

Fink, L. Dee. "First Year on the Faculty: Getting There." *Journal of Geography in Higher Education* 7 (1983): 45-56.

The First Year of College Teaching. New Directions for Teaching and Learning no. 17. Ed. L. Dee Fink. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1984.

Fisch, Linc. "An Alternative to a Big-Deal TA Training Program: Cooperative Departmental Efforts on Shoestring Budgets." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see below]: 155-57.

Fisher, Michele. "Rethinking the Foreign TA Problem." *Strengthening the Teaching Assistant Faculty* [see below]: 63-73.

Flanigan, Michael C. "Repairing a Teaching-Evaluation Program." *College Composition and Communication* 28 (1977): 378-80.

————. "Variety, the Key to Training Programs for Faculty and Teaching Assistants." *ADE Bulletin* no. 57 (1978): 44-46.

Ford, James F. "Training Graduate Teaching Assistants: Some Basic Considerations." *Dimension: Languages '78*. Proceedings of the Fourteenth Southern Conference on Language Teaching. Ed. Frederick L. Jenks. Atlanta: Spelman College, 1979: 139-56.

Foster, David. "Training Writing Teachers in a Small Program." *Writing Program Administration Journal* 10 (1986): 43-50.

Francek, Mark. "Suggestions for the New Geography Teaching Assistant." *Journal of Geography* 86 (1987): 216-18.

Franck, Marion R. & Fabian A. Samaniego. "The Supervision of Teaching Assistants: A New Use of Videotape." *Modern Language Journal* 65 (1981): 273-80.

——— & Michael A. Desousa. "Foreign TAs: A Course in Communication Skills." *Improving College and University Teaching* 30 (1982): 11-14.

Freed, Barbara F. "Why Train Teaching Assistants? Foreign Language and Communication at the University Level." *ADFL Bulletin* 7, ii (1975): 9-14.

———. "Preliminary Impressions of the Effects of a Proficiency-Based Language Requirement." *Foreign Language Annals* 20 (1987): 139-46.

Friedrich, Gustav & Robert Powell. "Workshop for Graduate Teaching Assistants." *Improving College and University Teaching* 27 (1979): 171-73.

——— & William J. Seiler. "The Influence of Differing Administrative Instructions on Student Ratings of Instructors." *Central States Speech Journal* 32 (1981): 111-17.

Fulwiler, Toby E. & Peter M. Schiff. "MSU [Michigan State University] Graduate Students Become MTU [Michigan Technological University] Writing Teachers." *Improving College and University Teaching* 28 (1980): 7-9.

Gandolfo, Anita. "Advantages of a Course Manual for Multisection Courses Taught by TAs." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see below]: 224-26.

Garland, T. Neal. "A Training Program for Graduate Teaching Assistants: The Experiences of One Department." *Teaching Sociology* 10 (1983): 487-503.

Garman, Noreen Bonk. "A Study of Clinical Supervision as a Resource for College Teachers of English." Diss., University of Pittsburgh, 1971.

Gefvert, Constance J. "An Apprenticeship for Teaching Assistants." *Freshman English News* 10 (1982): 16-19.

Gerhart, Genevra & Susan Wobst. "Russian Graduate Programs: Realities of the 1970's." *Slavic and East European Journal* 20 (1976): 174-85.

Gething, Thomas. "Stipends and Workloads." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see below]: 47- 49.

Giauque, Gerald S. "Using Native Speakers as Teaching Assistants." *Foreign Language Annals* 8 (1975): 128-32.

Gilbert, Claire P. & James F. McArthur. "In-Service Teacher Preparation of French Graduate Assistants: Design and Evaluation." *French Review* 48 (1975): 508 -21.

Goepper, Jane Black & Marty L. Knorre. "Pre- and In-Service Training of Graduate Teaching Assistants." *Modern Language Journal* 64 (1980): 446-50.

Goldfeder, Jerry. "Teacher Training for Teaching Assistants: An Experimental Program." *Teaching Political Science* 4, iii (1977): 341-50.

Golmon, Melton E. "A Teaching Seminar for Graduate Teaching Assistants in Zoology." *American Biology Teacher* 37, iv (1975): 231-33.

Gordon, Kenneth A. "The French Language Teaching Assistant Program: Pedagogical Techniques and Administrative Problems." *Meeting the Call for Excellence in the Foreign Language Classroom.* Report of the Central States Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. Ed. Patricia Westphal, Maurice W. Conner & Norman Choat. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company, 1985: 141- 48.

Green, Jerald R. "Supervision in the Foreign Language Classroom: Guidelines for the Department Chairman." *Modern Language Journal* 47 (1963): 366-68.

Gutiérrez, John R. "Making Better Use of the Native Teaching Assistant: Curricular Implications." *ADFL Bulletin* 19, i (1987): 28-29.

Hagiwara, Michio P. "Training and Supervision of College Foreign Language Teachers." *Foreign Language Annals* 3 (1968): 90-107.

———. "Training and Supervision of College Foreign Language Teachers." *Modern Language Journal* 53 (1969): 209-14.

———. *Leadership in Foreign Language Education: Trends in Training and Supervision of Graduate Assistants.* New York: MLA, 1970.

———. "Training and Supervision of Graduate Teaching Assistants. Part I, Analysis of Programs; Part II, Teaching Fellowship Stipends; Part III, Implications for Departments." *ADFL Bulletin* 1, iii (1970): 37-50.

———. "The Training of Graduate Teaching Assistants: Past, Present, and Future." *ADFL Bulletin* 7, iii (1976): 7-12.

———. "The TA System: Two Wrongs Do Not Make a Right." *ADFL Bulletin* 8, iii (1977): 26-28.

——— & William Berman. "Data on the Foreign Language Requirement: Fall 1969." *ADFL Bulletin* 1, iii (1970): 22-24.

Hairston, Maxine. "The Teaching Assistant Dilemma: Administrative Headache and Political Football." *ADE Bulletin* no. 53 (1977): 38-40.

Halio, Jay L. "Teaching the Teaching Assistant." *College English* 26 (1964): 226-28.

Hardy, Richard J. "The Role of Graduate Teaching Assistants in a Large American Government Class." *Teaching Political Science* 10 (1983): 136-40.

Hare, Geoff E. & Ray McAleese. "LAG: Development of a Training Simulation." *System* 13 (1985): 237- 42.

Haring-Smith, Tori. "The Importance of Theory in the Training of Teaching Assistants." *ADE Bulletin* no. 82 (1985): 33-39.

Hashimoto, Irvin Y. "Sensitizing Beginning Teachers of Writing." *Journal of Basic Writing* 3 (1984): 55-62.

Hatch, Deborah H & Christine R. Farris. "Helping TAs Use Active Learning Strategies." *Teaching Assistant Training in the 1990s* [see below]: 89-97.

Hayes, Alfred S., Wallace E. Lambert & G. Richard Tucker. "Evaluation of Foreign Language Teaching." *Foreign Language Annals* 1 (1967): 22-44.

Heim, Peggy & Becky Bogard. "Compensation of Graduate Assistants, 1968-69: A Preliminary Survey." *AAUP Bulletin* 55 (1969): 483- 87.

Heller, Scott. "Colleges Try Tests and Training to Make Sure Foreign TAs Can Be Understood." *Chronicle of Higher Education* (11 September 1985): 1, 32-33.

————. "Teaching Assistants Get Increased Training; Problems Arise in Foreign-Student Programs." *Chronicle of Higher Education* (29 October 1986): 9, 12-13.

Hellstrom, Ward. "Economics, Elitism, and Teacher Apprentice Programs." *ADE Bulletin* no. 77 (1984): 26-32.

Henderson, Ingeborg. "Training Teaching Assistants in the Yearlong Methods Course." *ADFL Bulletin* 16, ii (1985): 49-52.

————. "The Role of Graduate Teaching Assistants in CAI: Perspective on a Pilot Program." *Die Unterrichtspraxis* 19 (1986): 206-12.

————. "Public Relations as Part of the Methods Course for Graduate Teaching Assistants." *Die Unterrichtspraxis* 23 (1990): 26-29.

————. "TA Training im Fachbereich Wirtschaftsdeutsch." *Business German Handbook*. Ed. Christiane Keck. Cherry Hill, NJ: AATG, 1990.

Herald, Mary Clare. "The Assistance of Graduate Assistants." *Kappa Delta Pi Record* 6, iii (1970): 93.

Herold, William R. "Gaps in the Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers." *Foreign Language Annals* 10 (1977): 617-22.

Hope, Quentin M. "The Current Need: More Jobs, Fewer Job Seekers." *ADFL Bulletin* 9, i (1977): 18-21.

How to Succeed as a New Teacher: A Handbook for Teaching Assistants. New Rochelle, NY: Change Magazine Press, 1978.

Humphreys, W. Lee. "The TA Seminar and TA Support Services at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see below]: 171-73.

Hunt, Maurice. "Preventing Burn-out in Teaching Assistants." *Freshman English News* 15, i (1986): 12-15.

Hunter, John E., et al. " A Causal Analysis of Attitudes toward Leadership Training in a Classroom Setting." *Human Relations* 32 (1979): 889-907.

Institutional Responsibilities and Responses in the Employment and Education of Teaching Assistants: Readings from a National Conference. Ed. Nancy Van Note

Chism & Susan B. Warner. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Center for Teaching Excellence, 1987.

Jackson, William K. "Support Services for Graduate Teaching Assistants at the University of Georgia." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see above]: 158-59.

Jaros, Dean. "The Teaching Assistant and the University." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see above]: 369-71.

Jarvis, Gilbert A. "Pedagogical Knowledge for the Second Language Teacher." *Applied Linguistics and the Preparation of Second Language Teachers: Towards a Rationale*. Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics. Ed. James Alatis, H. H. Stern & Peter Strevens. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1983: 234-41.

Jean, Denis-J. "The Development of an Individualized Conversation Program Using Native-Level Speakers." *ADFL Bulletin* 12, iv (1981): 33-35.

Jennings, Edward H. "The Central Role of the Teaching Assistant in Higher Education." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see above]: 4-6.

Jossem, E. Leonard. "TA Pedagogical Separation: Should a General or a Discipline-Specific Approach Be Used?" *Institutional Responsibilities* [see above]: 111-14.

————. "The Role of the Professional Organization in the Development of TAs in Physics." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see above]: 115-17.

Kapfer, Miriam B. & Gabriel M. Della-Piana. "Educational Technology in the Inservice Education of University Teaching Fellows." *Educational Technology* 14 (1974): 22-28.

Kaufman, Margo R. "A Training Program for Teaching Assistants." *Foreign Language Annals* 10 (1977): 659- 61.

Keedy, Hugh F. "Graduate Teaching Assistants: Removing the Curse of Inexperience." *Engineering Education* 67 (1977): 398-99.

Kemper, John D. "Quality of Engineering Education Project: Preparation for the Teaching of Engineering." *Engineering Education* 76 (1985): 154-56.

Keniston, Hayward. "The Role of the Graduate School in the Training of the Modern Language Teacher." *Modern Language Journal* 7 (1922): 1- 4.

Kline, Michael B. "Individualizing French Through the Credit/No Credit Open-Ended Approach." *Foreign Language Annals* 9 (1976): 22-27.

Knapper, Christopher. "Large Classes and Learning." *Teaching Large Classes Well* [see below]: 5-15.

Knop, Constance K. & Carol A. Herron. "An Empirical Approach to Redesigning a TA Methods Course." *French Review* 55 (1982): 329-39.

Kovac, Gerald R. "Developing Effective Training Programs for History Teaching Assistants." *History Teacher* 10, i (1976): 59-65.

Krockover, Gerald H. "A Model to Improve Science Instruction by Graduate Teaching Assistants." *School Science and Mathematics* 80 (1980): 343-47.

Kytle, Ray. "Slaves, Serfs, or Colleagues—Who Shall Teach College Composition?" *College Composition and Communication* 22 (1971): 339-41.

Lafayette, Robert C. "Planning and Implementing a Successful Workshop." *Foreign Language Annals* 10 (1977): 671-75.

Lalande, John F., II. "Advancing the Case for an Advanced Methods Course." *Challenges in the 1990s* [see above]: 151–66.

———— & Gerhard F. Strasser. "A Survey of International Teaching Assistants in Foreign Language Departments." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see above]: 251- 62.

Lamberth, John & Debra Kosteski. "Using TA Ratings to Validate Student Evaluations: The Important Issues." *Teaching of Psychology* 9 (1982): 102-03.

Lampherar, Charles & Campbell R. McConnell. "A Note on the Use of Graduate Teaching Assistants in the Principles Course." *Journal of Economics Education* 1, ii (1970): 139-42.

Langford, Thomas A. "Recognizing Outstanding Teaching." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see above]: 132-33.

LaPidus, Jules B. "Preparing Faculty: Graduate Education's Role." *AAHE Bulletin* (June 1987): 3-6.

Larsen-Freeman, Diane. "Training Teachers or Educating a Teacher?" *Applied Linguistics and the Preparation of Second Language Teachers: Towards a Rationale.* Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics. Ed. James Alatis, H. H. Stern & Peter Strevens. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1983: 264-72.

Lawrence, Joyce V. "Fostering and Monitoring TA Development: What Administrators Can Do." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see above]: 44-46.

LeBlanc, Leona B. "Training for Language Teachers: A Model Program." *College Teaching* 35 (1987): 19-21.

Lee, James F. "Toward a Professional Model of Language Program Direction." *ADFL Bulletin* 19, i (1987): 22-25.

————. *A Manual and Practical Guide to Directing Foreign Language Programs and Training Graduate Teaching Assistants.* New York: Random House, 1989.

———— & Bill VanPatten. "The Question of Language Program Direction Is Academic." *Challenges in the 1990s* [see above]: 113–27.

Lee, Jeanne C. "College-Level Foreign Language Teacher Preparation." *WAFLT Forum*. Ed. Jean-Charles Seigneuret & David P. Benseler. Pullman, WA: Washington Association of Foreign Language Teachers, 1972.

Lehr, Fran. "Teaching Teachers to Teach Writing." *English Education* 15 (1983): 53-57.

Levinson-Rose, J. & R.J. Menges. "Improving College Teaching: A Critical Review of Research." *Review of Educational Research* 51 (1981): 403-34.

Loughrin-Sacco, Steven J. "Of Apples and Oranges: The Effects of Integrating Beginners and False Beginners in Elementary French." *Challenges in the 1990s* [see above]: 89–112.

MacAllister, Archibald T. "The Preparation of College Teachers of Modern Languages: A Conference Report." *PMLA* 79 (1964): 29-43; rpt. *Modern Language Journal* 50 (1966): 400-15.

Mackey, William F. "The New Technology of Teacher Training." *English Language Teaching* 23 (1968): 10-14.

Magnan, Sally Sieloff. "Teaming Teachers and Modifying Class Size: An Experiment in First-Year French." *French Review* 60 (1987): 454-65.

Majer, Kenneth S. "Preparing College Teachers." *Viewpoints* 49, iv (1973): 43-51.

Mangan, Katherine S. "IRS Hits Graduate Assistants with Audits that Could Cost Each as Much as $3,000." *Chronicle of Higher Education* (12 August 1987): 1, 41.

Mansour, George P. "An Eclectic Approach to Assessing TA Effectiveness." *ADFL Bulletin* 8, iv (1977): 24-26.

Marsi, Kenneth L. "Mid-Term Evaluation of Teaching Assistants." *Journal of Chemical Education* 55 (1978): 574-76.

Martin, Jack, et al. "Improving the Instructional Effectiveness of University Teaching Assistants: Report II." *Canadian Journal of Education* 3, ii (1978): 13-26.

Martin-Reynolds, Joanne & Marian Smith Hurley. "The Graduate Student Orientation Program at Bowling Green State University." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see above]: 167-70.

Marx, Ronald, et al. "Improving the Instructional Effectiveness of University Teaching Assistants: Report I." *Canadian Journal of Education* 3, ii (1978): 1-12.

———, et al. "The Training of Teaching Assistants in Canadian Universities: A Survey and Case Study." *Canadian Journal of Higher Education* 9 (1979): 55-63.

Mauksch, Hans O. "The Context of Preparing Teaching Assistants." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see above]: 14-18.

McAdam, Dale. "Bringing Psychology to Life." *Teaching of Psychology* 14 (1987): 29-31.

McCurdy, Donald W. & David W. Brooks. "Project Teach: To Teach Teaching Assistants." *Journal of College Science Teaching* 8 (1979): 233-34.

McGaghie, William C. & B. Claude Mathis. "Preparing Graduate Students for College Teaching: Rationale and Methods." *Improving College and University Teaching* 25 (1977): 220-21, 224.

McGee, Reece & Charlene S. Knuckman. *The Graduate Teaching Assistant: Effects on Students in Large Undergraduate Courses*. Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Institute for the Study of Social Change, 1969.

McMillen, Liz. "Teaching Assistants Get Increased Training; Problems Arise in Foreign Student Programs: Increased Training." *Chronicle of Higher Education* (29 October 1986): 9-11.

Meiden, Walter. "Training the Inexperienced Graduate Assistant for Language Teaching." *Modern Language Journal* 54 (1970): 168-74.

Mellon, Edward K. & Joseph B. Dence. "Orientation for Teaching Assistants Using Videorecorded Microteaching." *Journal of Chemical Education* 48 (1971): 674-75.

Mellor, Jeff. "Standard Oral Proficiency Tests for International Graduate Teaching Assistants." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see above]: 334-47.

Menges, Robert J. "A Seminar Practicum in Instructional Development." *Educational Research and Methods* 11 (1978): 12.

———. *Improving Graduate Teaching Assistants' Instruction through Attention to Their Implicit Theories of Teaching*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Center for the Teaching Professions, 1986.

——— & William C. Rando. "Graduate Teaching Assistants' Implicit Theories of Teaching." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see above]: 83-90.

Meredith, Gerald M. & D. N. Bub. "Evaluation of Apprenticeship Teaching in Higher Education." *Psychological Reports* 40 (1977): 1123-26.

——— & Todd H. Ogasawara. "Scale for Excellence in Teaching Award for Teaching Assistants." *Perceptual and Motor Skills* 53 (1981): 633-34.

Millman, Mary M. & Kenneth Cadenhead. "Un échange pas comme les autres: Normaliens et GTA's." *Foreign Language Annals* 20 (1987): 165-69.

Minkel, C. W. "A Graduate Dean's Perspective [on Training TAs]." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see above]: 27-29.

———. "The Formulation of University Policy for Graduate Assistantship Administration." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see above]: 35-37.

Mintzes, Joel J. "Overt Teaching Behaviors and Student Ratings of Instructors." *Journal of Experimental Education* 48 (1979): 145-53.

Mitzman, Barry. "Union Power for Teaching Assistants." *Change* 7, v (1975): 17-19.

Modern Language Association of America. "Recommendations from the Working Paper of the MLA Commission on the Future of the Profession." *ADFL Bulletin* 13, i (1981): 36-39.

Monaghan, Peter. "University Officials Deplore the Lack of Adequate Training Given to Teaching Assistants, Ponder How to Improve It." *Chronicle of Higher Education* (19 November 1989): A17.

Monson, Charles H., Jr. "Teaching Assistants: The Forgotten Faculty." *Educational Record* 50, i (1969): 60-65.

———. "On Teaching Teaching Assistants." *Phi Delta Kappan* 52, ii (1970): 93-94.

Monts, David L. & Miles Pickering. "Effect of TA Background on Student Laboratory Achievement." *Journal of Chemical Education* 58 (1981): 768-69.

Moskowitz, Gertrude. "The Classroom Interaction of Outstanding Foreign Language Teachers." *Foreign Language Annals* 9 (1976): 135-57.

Mozer, Forrest S. & Sondra M. Napell. "Instant Replay and the Graduate Teaching Assistant." *American Journal of Physics* 43, iii (1975): 242-44.

Mueller, Klaus A. "Aspects in Training and Supervising College Teachers of Foreign Languages." *Foreign Language Annals* 5 (1972): 236-39.

Mueller, Theodore H. "Programmed Language Instruction—Help for the Linguistically 'Underprivileged.'" *Modern Language Journal* 52 (1968): 79-84.

Muhlestein, L. D. & B. DeFacio. "Teaching Graduate Teaching Assistants to Teach." *American Journal of Physics* 42 (1974): 384-86.

Mulvihill, Edward R. "Teaching Assistants—University of Wisconsin." *ADFL Bulletin* 1, ii (1969): 29-31.

———. "Improving Apprenticeship." *ADFL Bulletin* 1, iii (1970): 34-36.

Murphy, Joseph A. "The Graduate Teaching Assistant in an Age of Standards." *Challenges in the 1990s* [see above]: 129-49.

Murphy, Michael D. "The Development and Assessment of an Experimental Teacher Training Program for Beginning Graduate Assistants in Chemistry." Diss., Ohio State University, 1972.

Muyskens, Judith A. "Preservice and Inservice Teacher Training: Focus on Proficiency." *Teaching for Proficiency: The Organizing Principle*. The ACTFL Foreign Language Education Series. Ed. Theodore V. Higgs. Skokie, IL: National Textbook Company, 1984: 179-200.

Nachtmann, Francis W. "A Practical Training Program for College Language Teachers." *Modern Language Journal* 47 (1963): 11-13.

Napell, Sondra M. "A TA Training Program at UC, Berkeley." *California Journal of Teacher Education* 4, i (1977): 143-52.

Nerenz, Anne G. "The Roles of the University Supervisor: Perceived Importance and Practical Implication." *Foreign Language Annals* 12 (1979): 471-75.

———, Carol A. Herron & Constance K. Knop. "The Training of Graduate Teaching Assistants in Foreign Languages: A Review of Literature and Description of Contemporary Programs." *French Review* 52 (1979): 873-89.

Nevill, Dorothy D., et al. "A Comparison of Student Ratings of Teaching Assistants and Faculty Members." *American Educational Research Journal* 15, i (1978): 25-37.

Nowlis, Vincent, et al. *The Graduate Student as Teacher*. American Council on Education Monographs 2. Washington, DC: ACE, 1968.

Nyquist, Jody D. & Donald H. Wulff. "The Training of Graduate Teaching Assistants at the University of Washington." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see above]: 144-54.

———, Robert D. Abbott & Donald H. Wulff. "The Challenge of TA Training in the 1990s." *Teaching Assistant Training in the 1990s* [see below]: 7-14.

Oates, Wallace E. & Richard E. Quandt. "The Effectiveness of Graduate Students as Teachers of the Principles of Economics." *Journal of Economics Education* 1, ii (1970): 131-38.

Øksenholt, Svein. "The Training of the Foreign Language Teaching Assistant." *Modern Language Journal* 47 (1963): 368-71.

Oxford, Rebecca, Madeline Ehrman & Roberta Z. Lavine. "Style Wars: Teacher-Student Style Conflicts in the Language Classroom." *Challenges in the 1990s* [see above]: 1-26.

Ozete, Oscar & Lucia Caycedo Garner. "A Working Model for Training and Supervising Teaching Assistants." *New Frontiers in Foreign Language Education*. Report on the Central States Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. Ed. Maurice W. Conner. Skokie, IL: National Textbook Company, 1980: 117-29.

Pargment, M. S. "Preparation of College Teachers in Modern Foreign Languages." *Educational Record* 25 (1944): 75-86.

Parrett, Joan L. "The Effect of Selected Variables on the Student Ratings of University Teaching Assistants." Diss., Pennsylvania State University, 1985.

————. "A Ten-Year Review of TA Training Programs: Trends, Patterns, and Common Practices." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see above]: 67-79.

Pavalko, R. M. & J. W. Holley. "Determinants of a Professional Self-Concept among Graduate Students." *Social Science Quarterly* 55 (1974): 462-77.

Penfield, Elizabeth F. "Process, Product, and the Administration of the English Department." *ADE Bulletin* no. 84 (1986): 11-15.

Pica, Teresa, Gregory A. Barnes & Alexis G. Finger. *Teaching Matters: Skills and Strategies for International Teaching Assistants*. New York: Newbury House, 1990.

Pickering, Miles. "Provocative Opinion: How to Win Friends and Motivate Teaching Assistants." *Journal of Chemical Education* 55 (1978): 511-12.

————. "Teaching Assistant Predictions of Student Performance in General Chemistry." *Journal of Chemical Education* 57 (1980): 354-55.

Piedmont, Ferdinand. "Group Observation and the Training of Teaching Assistants." *Die Unterrichtspraxis* 1, i (1968): 82- 86.

Ports, Cathy R. "A Three-Phase Approach to TA Training: The Program for Associate Instructors in French at Indiana University." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see above]: 239-43.

Powell, Robert E. "Effectively Utilizing TAs in the University." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see above]: 30-32.

"The Preparation of College Foreign Language Teachers." *PMLA*, 70 (1955): 57-68.

Puccio, Paul. "TAs Help TAs: Peer Counseling and Mentoring." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see above]: 219-23.

Pulgram, Ernst. "Preparation for Language Teaching." *Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*. Ed. Ernst Pulgram. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1954: 75-85.

Rava, Susan. "Training Teaching Assistants." *ADFL Bulletin* 19, i (1987): 26-27.

Reagan, Sally Barr. "Teaching TAs to Teach: Show, Don't Tell." *Writing Program Administration Journal* 11, iii (1988): 41-51.

Remak, Henry H. H. "The Training and Supervision of Teaching Assistants in German." *Modern Language Journal* 41 (1957): 212-14.

Renfrew, Malcolm M. & Therald Moeller. "The Training of Teaching Assistants in Chemistry: A Survey." *Journal of Chemical Education* 55 (1978): 386-88.

Rippetoe, Joseph K. & George R. Peters. "Introductory Courses and the Teaching Assistant." *Improving College and University Teaching* 27 (1979): 20-24.

Rivers, Wilga M. "The Revolution Now: Revitalizing the University Language Department." *Canadian Modern Language Review* 37 (1981): 447-61.

———. "Preparing College and University Instructors for a Lifetime of Teaching: A Luxury or a Necessity?" *ADFL Bulletin* 15, ii (1983): 23-29.

Roberts, D. D. "Survival and Prosperity: TA Training Colloquia." *Freshman English News* 10, iii (1982): 4, 12-14.

Robinson, Pauline C. "The Management of Language Training." *Language Teaching* 21 (1988): 146-57.

Rodriguez, Raul N. "Teaching Teaching to Teaching Assistants." *College Teaching* 33 (1985): 173-76.

Rogal, Samuel J. "Train Them First." *Improving College and University Teaching* 17 (1969): 44-47.

Rogers, Carmen Villegas. "Improving the Performance of Teaching Assistants in the Multi-Section Classroom." *Foreign Language Annals* 20 (1987): 403-10.

Rogow, Robert & Daniel R. Birch. "Teaching Assistant Unionization: Origins and Implications." *Canadian Journal of Higher Education* 14 (1984): 11-29.

Ronkowski, Shirley. "International and American TAs: Similarities and Differences." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see above]: 263-66.

Rosbottom, Ronald C. "A Chairman's Perspective [on Training TAs]." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see above]: 22-25.

Rose, Clare. "An In-Service Program for Teaching Assistants." *Improving College and University Teaching* 20 (1972): 100-02.

Rounds, Patricia L. "Characterizing Successful Classroom Discourse for NNS Teaching Assistant Training." *TESOL Quarterly* 21 (1987): 643-71.

Roy, Marie-Jose. "Moka au Chocolat v Apple Pie." *British Journal of Language Teaching* 24 (1986): 41-45.

Ruiz, Hildebrando. "The Role of Technique in Teacher Training." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see above]: 95-103.

Russo, Gloria M. "Training for TAs." *Improving College and University Teaching* 30 (1982): 171-74.

Ryder, Frank G. "Changes in Graduate Training: 'Pittious Worke of Mutabilitie'?" *ADFL Bulletin* 7, ii (1975): 3-8.

———. "Teacher Training Once More: Some Respectful Objections." *ADFL Bulletin* 8, ii (1976): 8-10.

Saal, Diane R. vom. "The Undergraduate Experience and International Teaching Assistants." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see above]: 267-74.

Sadow, S. & M. Maxwell. "The Foreign Teaching Assistant and the Culture of the American University Class." *On TESOL '82. Pacific Perspectives on Language Learning and Teaching*. Ed. Mark A. Clarke & Jean Handscombe. Washington, DC: TESOL, 1983: 253-58.

Saine, Thomas P. "The Evaluation of Teaching and the State of the University." *ADFL Bulletin* 10, iii (1979): 17-23.

Sammons, Jeffrey L. "Fewer but Better Russians: An Argument and a Proposal Concerning the Job Market and Graduate Student Teaching." *Die Unterrichtspraxis* 7, ii (1974): 14-21.

Sarkisian, Ellen. "Training Foreign Teaching Assistants: Using Videotape to Observe and Practice Communicating and Interacting with Students." *On TESOL '84. A Brave New World for TESOL*. Ed. Penny Larson, Elliot L. Judd & Dorothy S. Messerschmitt. Washington, DC: TESOL, 1984: 325-33.

Saunders, Phillip. "More on the Use of Graduate Student Instructors in the Introductory Economics Course." *Journal of Economic Education* 3, i (1971): 36-40.

Sayer, James Edward. "A Need for Improved Teacher-Training: A Necessity for Future Academic Preparation and Employment." *Clearing House* 51 (1978): 213-15.

Schade, Wayne R. & Rolland B. Bartholomew. "Analysis of Geology Teaching Assistant Reaction to a Training Program Utilizing Videotaped Teaching Episodes." *Journal of Geological Education* 28 (1980): 96-102.

Scherer, George A. C. "The Development of University Programs to Adequately Prepare Foreign Language Teachers and Teaching Assistants." *The Teaching of German: Problems and Methods*. Ed. Eberhard Reichmann. Philadelphia: National Carl Schurz Association, 1970: 460-65.

Schmidt, Peter. "Orientation of New Teaching Assistants: A Struggle with Time." *Die Unterrichtspraxis* 7, ii (1974): 41-46.

Schneider, Katharine S. & Scott G. Stevens. "Curriculum Considerations for a Campus-wide International Teaching Associate Training Program." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see above]: 284-89.

Schulz, Renate A. "TA Training, Supervision, and Evaluation: Report of a Survey." *ADFL Bulletin* 12, i (1980): 1-8.

———. "Proficiency-Based Foreign Language Requirements: A Plan for Action." *ADFL Bulletin* 19, ii (1988): 24-28.

———. "Bridging the Gap between Teaching and Learning: A Critical Look at Foreign Language Textbooks." *Challenges in the 1990s* [see above]: 167-81.

Seidman, Ann. "Some Suggestions for Graduate School Education." *Improving College and University Teaching* 25 (1977): 69-74.

Sequeira, Debra-L & Magdalena Costantino. "Issues in ITA Training Programs." *Teaching Assistant Training in the 1990s* [see below]: 79-86.

———— & Ann L. Darling. "A Multiperspective Approach to International Teaching Assistant Training: The International Teaching Assistant Project of the Center for Instructional Development and Research, University of Washington." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see above]: 307-15.

Seyfarth, Sue. "The Professional Development Program: More Than One Opportunity at Iowa." *Freshman English News* 10 (1982): 14-16.

Sharp, Gregory. "Acquisition of Lecturing Skills by University Teaching Assistants: Some Effects of Interest, Topic Relevance, and Viewing a Model Videotape." *American Educational Research Journal* 18 (1981): 491-502.

Sheehan, Jacqueline, et al. "Improving Skills of Teaching Assistants." *Teaching to Potential: Proceedings of the Regional Conference on University Teaching*. Las Cruces, NM: New Mexico State University, 1986 [ED 276 328].

Shymansky, James A. & John E. Penick. "Do Laboratory Teaching Assistants Exhibit Sex Bias?" *Journal of College Science Teaching* 8 (1979): 222-26.

Siebring, B. Richard. "A Training Program for Teaching Assistants." *Improving College and University Teaching* 20 (1972): 98-99.

Simpson, Isaiah. "Training and Evaluating Teaching Assistants through Team Teaching." *Freshman English News* 15, iii (1987): 4, 9-13.

Sledd, James H. "Or Get Off the Pot: Notes Toward the Restoration of Moderate Honesty Even in English Departments." *ADE Bulletin* no. 52 (1977): 1-7.

Smith, Al & Susan Goodale. "Assessing and Responding to the Needs of Teaching Assistants." *Journal of Staff, Program & Organizational Development* 1 (1983): 21-25.

Smith, Albert B. "A Model Program for Training Teaching Assistants." *Improving College and University Teaching* 22 (1974): 198-200.

Smith, Karen L. "Moving Spanish Language Programs into the 80's: Hypotheses and Questions." *Hispania* 69 (1986): 223-29.

Smith, Rosslyn. "Training International TAs at Texas Tech: An Overview." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see above]: 318-20.

Smock, Richard & Robert Menges. "Programs for TAs in the Context of Campus Policies and Priorities." *Strengthening the Teaching Assistant Faculty* [see below]: 21-33.

Spears, Jacqueline & Dean Zollman. "Orientation for the New Teaching Assistant—A Laboratory Based Program." *American Journal of Physics* 42 (1974): 1062-66.

Spooner, Michael & Holly O'Donnell. "From Cheap Labor to Junior Colleague: Training TAs in Composition." *English Education* 19 (1987): 122-26.

Sprague, Jo & Jody N. Nyquist. *A Developmental Perspective on the TA Role*. Seattle, WA: Seattle University Center for Instructional Development and Research, 1989.

————. "TA Supervision." *Teaching Assistant Training in the 1990s* [see below]: 37-53.

Sprecher, Susan & Ollie Pocs. "Teaching Sexuality: Two Techniques for Personalizing the Large Class." *Teaching Sociology* 15 (1987): 268-72.

Staton, Ann Q. & Ann L. Darling. "Socialization of Teaching Assistants." *Teaching Assistant Training in the 1990s* [see below]: 15-22.

Staton-Spicer, Ann Q. & Jody D. Nyquist. "Improving the Teaching Effectiveness of Graduate Teaching Assistants." *Communication Education* 28 (1979): 199-205.

Stein, Jack, et al. "The Preparation of College and University Teachers." *PMLA* 76 (1961): 12-14; rpt. *Modern Language Teaching in School and College*. Ed. Seymour L. Flaxman. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1961: 32-41.

Stelzner, Sara Latham. "Peer Training in a Teaching Improvement Program for TAs." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see above]: 208-14.

Stockdale, Dennis L. & Zachary S. Wochok. "Training TAs to Teach." *Journal of College Science Teaching* 3 (1974): 345-49.

Stovall, James Glen. "Reflections on the Difficult Task of Grading Writing Assignments." *Journalism Educator* 41 (1986): 4-7.

Strengthening the Teaching Assistant Faculty. New Directions for Teaching and Learning no. 22. Ed. John D. W. Andrews. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985.

Strickland, Karen Syvrud. "Planning and Facilitating a Group Workshop." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see above]: 215-18.

Swaffar, Janet K. "Articulating Learning in High School and College Programs: Holistic Theory in the Foreign Language Curriculum." *Challenges in the 1990s* [see above]: 27-54.

Szymanski, J. R. "Training the Foreign Language Teaching Assistant." *Improving College and University Teaching* 26 (1978): 71-73.

Tave, Stuart. "The Guilt of the Professor." *ADE Bulletin* no. 59 (1978): 6-12.

Taylor, Anita. "Part-Time Faculty: Properly Using and Not Abusing." *ACA Bulletin* 55 (1986): 86-88.

The Teaching Apprentice Program in Language and Literature. Ed. Joseph Gibaldi & James V. Mirollo. New York: MLA, 1981.

Teaching Assistant Training in the 1990s. New Directions for Teaching and Learning no. 39. Ed. Robert E. Young. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1989.

Teschner, Richard C. "A Profile of the Specialization and Expertise of Lower Division Foreign Language Program Directors in American Universities." *Modern Language Journal* 71 (1987): 28-35.

Thomas, Ronald E. & John W. Richardson. "Study of English Proficiency Standards for Foreign Graduate Students." *College and University* 53 (1978): 201-08.

Toliver, Suzanne S. "Proficiency-Based Instruction and Teaching Assistant Supervision." *Die Unterrichtspraxis* 17 (1984): 299-306.

Turitz, N. J. "A Survey of Training Programs for Foreign Teaching Assistants in American Universities." *Foreign Teaching Assistants in U.S. Universities*. Ed. K. M. Bailey, F. Pialorsi & J. Zukowski-Faust. Washington, DC: NAFSA, 1984.

Turner, Joan. "TA Perception of Problem and TA Perception of Role in Teaching Spanish." Diss., Ohio State University, 1988.

Turner, R. "The Weakest Link in Foreign Language Teaching." *Improving College and University Teaching* 15 (1967): 151-55.

Vattano, Frank J. & John S. Avens. "Courses on College Teaching." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see above]: 180-86.

Vecchio, Robert & Frank Costin. "Predicting Teacher Effectiveness from Graduate Admissions Predictors." *American Educational Research Journal* 14 (1977): 169-76.

Weimer, Maryellen, Marilla D. Svinick & Gabriele Bauer. "Designing Programs to Prepare TAs to Teach." *Teaching Assistant Training in the 1990s* [see above]: 57-70.

Welty, Samuel Robert "The Preparation of College and University Modern Language Teachers: The Ideal and the Actual." Diss., Florida State University, 1971.

White, Kathleen M. & Robert G. Kolber. "Undergraduate and Graduate Students as Discussion Section Leaders." *Teaching of Psychology* 5, i (1978): 6-9.

Whitely, Susan E. & Kenneth O. Doyle, Jr. "Validity and Generalizability of Student Ratings from Between-Classes and Within-Class Data." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 71 (1979): 117-24.

Wilson, Tom & Jeanie Stearns. "Improving the Working Relationship between Professor and TA." *Strengthening the Teaching Assistant Faculty* [see above]: 35-45.

Winkelman, John. "Training College Language Teachers." *Modern Language Journal* 44 (1960): 210-16.

Wolff, Florence. "Assistant: mettre en contact avec la langue." *Le français dans le monde* 207 (February-March 1987): 59-61.

Wright, Delivee L. "A Seminar on College Teaching." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see above]: 177-79.

———. "TA Training Resources." *Teaching Assistant Training in the 1990s* [see above]: 125-32.

Yoder, Donald D. & Lawrence W. Hugenberg. "A Survey of In-Service Teacher Training Programs for Graduate Teaching Assistants." *ACA Bulletin* 39 (1982): 59-63.

Zimpher, Nancy L. & Susan Yessayan. "An Overview of an Orientation Program for Graduate Teaching Associates at The Ohio State University." *Institutional Responsibilities* [see above]: 160-66.

Contributors

Robert Ariew is Associate Professor of French in the Department of French and Italian at the University of Arizona. He is the author of articles on computer-assisted language learning (CALL) and of software for teaching French and Spanish. He is co-author of the recent introductory French college textbook, *C'est à dire.*

Betsy K. Barnes is Associate Professor of French and Co-Director of the French Language Program at the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities Campus. She teaches courses in French language and linguistics and in second language methodology. Her current research areas include the syntax and pragmatics of spoken French, as well as second language acquisition.

David P. Benseler is Professor of German at Ohio State University and Editor (since 1980) of the *Modern Language Journal*. He has been Distinguished Visiting Professor at the U.S. Military Academy, West Point, and at New Mexico State University. Chair of the Department of German, Ohio State University from 1977-85, his publications include over fifty books and articles, most recently *Teaching German in America: Prolegomena to a History*. His honors and awards include the *Bundesverdienstkreuz* (from the President of the Federal Republic of Germany, 1985) for contributions to German studies and the U.S. Army Distinguished Civilian Service Medal (from the Commandant, U. S. Military Academy, 1988).

Theodore E. D. Braun is Professor of French and Comparative Literature at the University of Delaware and Coordinator of FR 105. He has authored textbooks and articles on French grammar and pedagogy, has introduced TPR to the French program at Delaware and helped reform the curriculum, and has developed CAI/CALL programs in vocabulary and verb morphology.

Christine Cronjaeger is completing her doctorate in German at Ohio State University with a dissertation on Wilhelm Raabe. For the past two years she has been Assistant to the Director of Undergraduate Language Instruction in the Department of German. She has presented several papers on the teaching of various cultural topics at scholarly and professional meetings. She is the recipient of several awards for teaching, research, and departmental service.

Madeline E. Ehrman is Director of Research, Evaluation, and Development in the School of Language Studies of the Foreign Service Institute in the U.S. Department of State. She is also an associate staff psychotherapist with the Meyer Treatment Center of the Washington School of Psychiatry. Her research specialties are styles, strategies, and affective aspects of language learning.

Charles J. James is Associate Professor of German at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, where he teaches courses in language and methodology. He edited two ACTFL Annual Volumes (*Practical Applications of Research in Foreign Language Teaching* and *Foreign Language Proficiency in the Classroom and Beyond*) and has published in the areas of listening comprehension and current German culture. He is a founding member of AAUSC and served as its first Treasurer as well as first Editor of its Newsletter.

Carol A. Klee is Associate Professor of Hispanic Linguistics and Director of the Spanish and Portuguese Language Programs at the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities Campus. She teaches graduate courses on sociolinguistics, Spanish dialectology, and the acquisition of Spanish as a first and second language. Her primary areas of research include Spanish/English and Spanish/Quechua bilingualism and sociolinguistics. She is the editor of the journal *Hispanic Linguistics* and a former Secretary/Treasurer of AAUSC.

John F. Lalande, II is Associate Professor of German at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, where he directs the elementary German program, supervises graduate TAs, and teaches courses in language, methodology, and teacher education. He edited the Report of the 1988 Central States Conference entitled *Shaping the Future of Foreign Language Education: FLES, Articulation, and Proficiency*. He currently serves as Vice-President of AAUSC.

Roberta Z. Lavine combines a strong background in Spanish literature with practical experience in Spanish language instruction. Her current position is Assistant Professor of Spanish and Coordinator of Spanish Teaching Assistants at the University of Maryland at College Park. Her recent research has focused on task-based language learning and on diary studies involving language learning strategies. She has recently been awarded a Lilly Fellowship for innovation in undergraduate university studies.

James F. Lee is Assistant Professor of Spanish and Director of Basic Language Instruction in the Department of Spanish, Italian, and Por-

tuguese at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. He publishes in the area of second language reading research and has also co-edited several collections of research including *Second Language Acquisition/ Foreign Language Learning*. He is also the author of *A Manual and Practical Guide to Directing Language Programs and Training Teaching Assistants*.

Steven J. Loughrin-Sacco is currently Associate Professor of French at Michigan Technological University in Houghton, Michigan, where he teaches all levels of French language and intercultural communication. He is also supervisor of graduate teaching assistants in French, German, Japanese, and Spanish. His current research interests are foreign language acquisition in the classroom setting, using naturalistic inquiry as the research paradigm. He has published articles in *Foreign Language Annals*, the *ADFL Bulletin*, and the *Canadian Modern Language Review*. In 1988 he was the recipient of a Distinguished Teaching Award at Michigan Technological University, and in 1990 he was a finalist in the State of Michigan Distinguished Teaching Award in competition with language teachers at all Michigan public and private colleges and universities.

Sally Sieloff Magnan is Associate Professor of French at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, where she teaches courses in French language and teaching methodology and supervises teaching assistants. Her primary research interests are foreign language teaching methodology, error analysis, and proficiency testing. She is Editor of the 1990 Northeast Conference Reports entitled *Shifting the Instructional Focus to the Learner* and a co-author of the introductory college French textbook *En Route*. She is a former President of AAUSC.

Joseph A. Murphy is Professor of French and Foreign Language Education at West Virginia University, where he coordinates the Ed.D. program in Foreign Language Education, coordinates elementary French classes, and supervises the French teaching assistant program. He directed the ESL program at WVU from 1980-83 and also served as Assistant Dean of the Graduate School from 1979-80. He currently chairs the AATF Commission on Professional Standards and the Model Curricula subcommittee of the AATF Task Force on Proficiency. He was twice President of the West Virginia AATF and has served as a consultant to ETS since 1987. He has published French and ESL readers for Heinle & Heinle and is currently working on a series of advanced French textbooks for Houghton Mifflin. He is also a former Secretary/Treasurer of AAUSC.

Rebecca L. Oxford is Associate Professor of Foreign Language Education at the University of Alabama. She lectures widely on language learning styles and strategies in the U.S. and other parts of the world. She also

works extensively with motivation and other affective variables in learning languages and other subjects. Her recent book, *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*, was published by Newbury House/Harper & Row.

Bonnie A. Robb is Assistant Professor of French language and literature at the University of Delaware and Sequence Supervisor of FR 105/106/107. She has helped design the French curriculum, has been supervisor of Foreign Language Education majors, and has recently revamped the FLE major program.

Renate A. Schulz is Professor of German and Second Language Acquisition and Teaching in the Department of German at the University of Arizona. She is spending the 1990-91 academic year as Visiting Distinguished Professor at the U.S. Air Force Academy. A former editor of *Die Unterrichtspraxis*, she has authored books and articles dealing with foreign language teaching and learning, as well as textbooks. She is presently serving as President of AATG.

Janet Swaffar is Professor of German at the University of Texas at Austin. She was Secretary of the Navy Fellow at the U.S. Naval Academy in Annapolis during the period in which she wrote the present contribution. In her publications on literature and pedagogical practice she has consistently investigated and worked with techniques that enable learners to become aware of and responsible for their own language acquisition. Her most recent book is entitled *Reading for Meaning: An Integrated Approach to Language Learning*, written with Katherine Arens and Heidi Byrnes and published by Prentice-Hall.

Bill VanPatten is Associate Professor of Spanish at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. His research areas include the development of learner language, input and input processing, and the impact of instruction on language acquisition. He has authored many articles and chapters for books, is the co-editor of several collections of research, and has co-authored two introductory college-level Spanish textbooks. He is currently working on a series of content-based textbooks for college-level Spanish as well as a 52-episode introductory telecourse for Spanish.

Ray M. Wakefield is Associate Professor in the Department of German at the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities Campus, where he is Director of Language Instruction and Dutch Studies. In addition to second language acquisition, his research interests include medieval Dutch and German literature.

Future Volume Topics of Issues in Language Program Direction

1991: Assessing Foreign Language Proficiency of Undergraduates

Editor: Richard V. Teschner, University of Texas at El Paso

1992: Development and Supervision of Teaching Assistants in Foreign Languages

Editor: Joel Walz, University of Georgia

1993: The Dynamics of Language Program Direction

Editor: David P. Benseler, Ohio State University

ISBN 0-8384-2548-8

90000>

9 780838 425480

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

244

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

X	This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.
	This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").